United Nations S/PV.6805 (Resumption 1)

Security Council

Sixty-seventh year

Provisional

6805th meeting
Thursday, 12 July 2012, 3 p.m.
New York

President:	Ms. Holguín Cuéllar/Mr. Alzate/Ms. Rengifo Vargas	(Colombia)
Members:	Azerbaijan	Mr. Huseynli
	China	Mr. Zhang Changwei
	France	Mr. Bertoux
	Germany	Mrs. Osten-Vaa
	Guatemala	Ms. Bolaños Pérez
	India	Mr. Raguttahalli
	Morocco	Mr. Benmoussa
	Pakistan	Mr. Ahmad
	Portugal	Mr. Courela
	Russian Federation	Ms. Evstigneeva
	South Africa	Mr. Ratlou
	Togo	Mr. M'Beou
	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	Ms. Davison
	United States of America	Ms. Finerty

Agenda

Post-conflict peacebuilding

Report of the Peacebuilding Commission on its fifth session (S/2012/70)

Note verbale dated 2 July 2012 from the Permanent Mission of Colombia to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General (S/2012/511)

This record contains the text of speeches delivered in English and of the interpretation of speeches delivered in the other languages. The final text will be printed in the *Official Records of the Security Council*. Corrections should be submitted to the original languages only. They should be incorporated in a copy of the record and sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned to the Chief of the Verbatim Reporting Service, room U-506.

12-41726 (E)

Please recycle

The meeting was resumed at 3.05 p.m.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): I wish to remind all speakers to limit their statements to no more than four minutes in order to enable the Council to carry out its work expeditiously. Delegations with lengthy statements are kindly requested to circulate the text in writing and to deliver a condensed version when speaking in the Chamber.

I now give the floor to the representative of Luxembourg.

Ms. Lucas (Luxembourg) (*spoke in French*): Luxembourg fully aligns itself with the statement to be made later by the observer of the European Union.

I would like to thank you, Sir, for having organized this open debate on peacebuilding, which enables the Council to focus on issues of peacebuilding and post-conflict stabilization and the work accomplished by the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC) in this context. It also allows all interested parties to deepen their understanding and their ownership of the work of the Peacebuilding Commission. I would like to welcome in this regard the participation of Mr. Von Amsberg. The full engagement of the World Bank and other regional and international financial institutions is essential to a coordinated and coherent approach to peacebuilding and development efforts.

While it is true that peacebuilding in general does not lead to immediately quantifiable outcomes, the efforts towards it are nonetheless essential to creating sustainable peace and security over the longer term and to paving the way to development. Given my experience as Chair of the Guinea country-specific configuration of the Peacebuilding Commission and given the Commission's mandate, allow me to offer some comments regarding the questions raised in the excellent concept note prepared by the Colombian presidency for this debate (S/2012/511).

One strength of the Peacebuilding Commission is its intergovernmental nature and its mobilizing potential. The Guinea configuration alone brings together 46 Member States, as well as important regional and international actors, such as the African Union, the European Union and the International Organization of the Francophonie. The Commission thus offers a valuable framework to orchestrate the efforts of various stakeholders at work in the country concerned and to avoid possible gaps that could result from an absence of dialogue or insufficient information flow among parties from different backgrounds.

The Peacebuilding Commission is not and should not be an operational body. It is a political platform designed to enable the country in question to attract the necessary international support to achieve its peacebuilding and State-building priorities. The Commission must be a space where the deep-seated obstacles to peacebuilding – be they political deadlocks, structural or socio-economic difficulties, or regional challenges – can be addressed and counted.

In the case of Guinea, the Peacebuilding Commission is the only international actor with a political mandate to address these issues. We have, together with the authorities of Guinea, identified priorities for action in the areas of national reconciliation, reform of the security and defence sectors, and youth and women's employment. These priorities are set down in a statement of mutual commitments.

It is true that the PBC must improve its way of doing business. By this, I refer in particular to greater ownership of the Peacebuilding Commission by its member States, as well as to a better understanding and ownership of the role of the Commission by United Nations system actors, in order to avoid any form of competition between the representatives of the United Nations system on the ground and the country-specific configurations. I remain convinced nevertheless that the PBC has an essential role to play in raising the awareness of relevant stakeholders to the needs of countries emerging from conflict or crisis and in mobilizing the energies necessary for their recovery.

Like the President of the Organizational Committee of the PBC, Ambassador Momen, I am also convinced that the Peacebuilding Commission can give added value to the Council's work when the latter is considering the situation of countries on the agenda of a specific configuration not only by shining a light on ongoing peacebuilding activities, but also, in more general terms, by helping to achieve the transition between peacekeeping and peacebuilding in the best possible way. The Peacebuilding Commission can also usefully contribute to the Council's consideration of regional challenges, such as transnational organized crime or drug or human trafficking.

We have stressed time and again that our cooperation with the countries on the agenda of the PBC is based on the principles of national ownership, partnership and

mutual accountability. These principles breathe life into the triple role of the country-specific configurations: political support and advocacy, support to coherence and coordination, and resource mobilization. These principles must also inspire our interaction in the interest of the populations of the countries on the agenda of the Peacebuilding Commission and in general of countries emerging from conflict.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): I give the floor to the representative of Canada.

Mr. Rishchynski (Canada): At the outset, let me commend the Colombian presidency for its initiative in convening this important debate on post-conflict peacebuilding.

International assistance still suffers from inadequate coordination, insufficient attention and persistent capacity gaps. In short, the challenges that motivated the creation of the United Nations peacebuilding architecture remain very relevant today.

Canada's experience as Chair of the Sierra Leone configuration is instructive in this regard. In Sierra Leone, the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC) is fortunate to work with highly effective partners. The Government has articulated a clear national vision for development that includes reference to peacebuilding challenges in the areas of good governance, youth unemployment and combating drug trafficking, which the PBC has adopted as its own priorities. Sierra Leone's international partners are also providing committed and coordinated assistance. Most importantly, the United Nations Integrated Peacebuilding Office in Sierra Leone and the United Nations country team have developed an innovative joint approach that uses peacebuilding as an overarching frame – a leitmotif – for their wider efforts.

In the context of such well-functioning arrangements, including strong political leadership from the United Nations in the field, the Commission has served as a source of support when needed. It has aligned directly with national priorities, endorsed the innovative approach adopted in Freetown, and provided strong support for the United Nations political engagement.

(*spoke in French*)

While this record shows promise and the PBC is a rapidly evolving institution, faster progress is needed. The PBC faces several interrelated challenges. First, it was assigned an ambitious mandate, but limited authority. If the Commission is to succeed, a wider group of Member States should use it as a tool for enhancing international support. Secondly, peacebuilding involves engagement with a wide range of actors. The PBC needs to be better integrated with these existing processes, especially with respect to the work of the United Nations system at Headquarters and in the field. In this respect, the Commission should also continue to deepen growing partnerships with the World Bank, the International Monetary Fund and the African Development Bank. Based on this assessment, Canada would like to offer some suggestions.

(*spoke in English*)

First, the Peacebuilding Commission should continue to integrate itself into emerging peacebuilding policy and practice. Its contribution, strategic approach and modality of engagement should be tailored to the needs of each case and sensitive to where the Commission can make a difference. In this sense, the Peacebuilding Commission should prioritize providing added value to wider peacebuilding processes ahead of its own bureaucratic needs and visibility.

Secondly, Member States bear the ultimate responsibility for the success or failure of the Commission. More committed engagement in New York, from capitals and in the field should be considered. The Commission should also work to identify opportunities for the concrete involvement of a much wider range of actors.

Canada believes that, on the whole, the Organization has made steady progress in the face of enduring challenges. It also has the potential to make a much greater contribution. The Commission and the Security Council should work to deepen their partnership. The Commission can also better tailor its advice to the Security Council's approach in a given country. And we believe that, with greater focus on delivering added value, the Commission could be better prepared to turn potential into reality.

(*spoke in French*)

We thank you once again, Sir, for this opportunity to share with the Security Council our comments and experience with the PBC.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): I give the floor to the representative of Sweden.

Mr. Tillander (Sweden): Sweden associates itself with the statement to be delivered by the observer of the European Union.

Since April this year, Sweden has held the Chair of the Liberia configuration of the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC). I will be serving in that capacity on a full-time basis. Since I assumed this position, I have visited Liberia once and will make my next trip later this month. The national commitment of Sweden will be broad, strong and long-term. We will continue our high-level political dialogue with Liberia; our bilateral cooperation programme and the work of the Embassy in Monrovia will intensify; we play a lead role in the World Trade Organization to pave the way for increased Liberian trade; and in the New Deal pilot with Liberia and the United States, we will focus efforts on realizing State-building goals.

My comments will be made with these commitments in mind. I will focus my intervention on questions raised in the concept note (S/2012/511), using Liberia as an example.

First, how can the PBC produce added value in a crowded and fragmented field of operational actors? Our common aim is to see Liberia consolidate peace. We will be better able to achieve this if the United Nations system works in a coordinated manner and if there is a smooth transition from United Nations peacekeeping to long-term development efforts.

Towards this end, the PBC's lack of operational mandate might actually be one of its key assets. The PBC can promote coherence by unblocking impasses, facilitating cooperation and coordination, and playing a catalytic role in maximizing the capacity of the entire United Nations family and its common efforts. Here is an important connection to the United Nations Delivering as One and to a coordinated approach for the international community as a whole. This is also in line with the recommendation of the 2010 PBC review that the Commission strengthen linkages between New York and the field and work closely with the Special Representatives of the Secretary-General.

Concern has been voiced about the PBC's limited visibility, but increased visibility is not the main objective and probably not a very good measure of success. It may actually make the field more crowded. A better measure of success is concrete change on the ground, which would likely be best realized through a team effort.

The second question from the concept note is: How can we use the tools of the PBC to make a tangible impact at the country level? Central to this will be the PBC's concrete support for national ownership – a theme that many have already commented on. Careful selection of the issues where the PBC can make a difference is another aspect of this.

One such issue is that of the police, which play a key role in enabling the United Nations Mission in Liberia (UNMIL) to carry out a responsible withdrawal. As the Council is aware, based on its recent deliberations on Liberia, the number of police there needs to be doubled. That should be done in the context of strengthening the full range of the rule of law protections in the context of the continued security sector reform. While the international engagement should continue under UNMIL's overall responsibility for the immediate future, it is also essential to enhance collaboration with bilateral partners in order to provide qualified trainers and take the lead in specialized fields.

As a follow-up to my discussion with the President during my visit in May on the need for increased coherence in police training, I convened two steering group meetings with United Nations colleagues and representatives from both Monrovia and Headquarters. The United Nations peacekeeping Mission in Liberia prepared a discussion paper, and we reached some preliminary views that will be useful in the upcoming UNMIL transition workshop. We also agreed on a lessons-learned paper to be presented at that workshop. One of the main objectives of my coming trip will be to participate in the workshop and to continue discussions with the Government on the issue.

The process of national reconciliation is another example of an area where the PBC is playing a supportive role. A key purpose of my next mission is to participate in the national conference at which the road map for national healing and reconciliation will be endorsed. My main contribution will be to advocate for an inclusive process.

As Chair of the configuration, I will continue to do my best to mobilize the political support and resources required for building sustainable peace in Liberia. We are already working with the Government of Liberia, with the partners in the configuration and with the United Nations system. I look forward to building a strong partnership with the new Special Representative of the Secretary-General, Ms. Karin Landgren, and to

our working together with the international financial institutions and bilateral partners.

Political will is fundamental. Part of the PBC's political backing will be to support continuing political commitment to inclusive governance, political reform, gender and women as agents for change, and inclusive national reconciliation. The statement of mutual commitments is a useful basis for this dialogue and also a mutual accountability mechanism. It also implies a political and budgetary commitment on the part of the Government of Liberia. Budgetary allocations for security and justice, including the police sector, should increase. I plan to discuss resource mobilization, including budgetary allocations, with the Liberian Government during my upcoming visit.

In all those efforts, the PBC will benefit from interaction with the Security Council. That is why we welcome this dialogue and express support for a continuation, which would enhance the impact and weight of our advocacy efforts.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): I now give the floor to the representative of Switzerland.

Mr. Seger (Switzerland) (*spoke in French*): I would like to thank you, Mr. President, for the efforts you have made to bring this important, and indeed essential, debate before the Security Council.

As we heard this morning, the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC) is still facing considerable challenges, almost seven years since it was established. As Chair of the Burundi configuration, I fully endorse the statement made this morning by the Chair of the PBC, Ambassador Momen. I would like to add some personal reflections on relations between the Security Council and the PBC, particularly with regard to specific configurations. Let us bear in mind that it was the Security Council, together with the General Assembly, that established the PBC in 2005. Today, the question still remains as to how cooperation between the Council and the PBC can be strengthened. To answer that question, I believe a number of points should be clarified.

First – something we saw this morning – the process of peacebuilding is basically carried out by the countries on the PBC's agenda. Ownership of that process by the Governments in question is one of the key factors for success. Unlike the Security Council, the PBC does not wield any decision-making powers. We cannot adopt resolutions or impose sanctions on the countries under consideration. As Chair of a configuration, I would compare my role to that of a co-pilot guiding the captain of a large ship. It is the captain who is at the helm, but I advise him on the course to take and the obstacles to avoid. Our only means are spoken ones: good advice and persuasion.

But even without such so-called instruments of power, the work of the PBC is bearing fruit. In the case of Burundi, the situation has stabilized considerably. The country has made great progress, although considerable challenges remain. By the way, that is why, in my opinion, we have all continued to support that country, particularly in supporting resource mobilization. In that regard, I greatly appreciate the help of the World Bank and the African Development Bank. I should take this opportunity to recall that, on 29 and 30 October, we will hold a donors' conference in support of Burundi in Geneva, in which I invite all here to participate.

Secondly, the added value that the Commission brings – compared, for example, with the complementary activities of the Special Representatives of the Secretary-General — is that it speaks in the name of the State. As Chair of the configuration, the power and persuasiveness of my words depend greatly upon the support I receive from the configuration's other members.

Thirdly, the configurations can, in my view, lighten and supplement the work of the Council by supporting and providing an appropriate framework for post-conflict States. We can thus act as a sort of safety net on the Council's behalf. If the situation in the countries on the PBC's agenda is stable, the Council does not need to worry about them. On the other hand, if it deteriorates, the PBC is there to alert the Council. However, in order to fully perform that supplementary role, the PBC needs the support of the Security Council. Above all, it needs political support for the country under the configuration's consideration, but it also needs support and recognition as an institution. Better institutional interaction between the Security Council and the PBC through its configurations would benefit both bodies. That would begin with a more systematic involvement on the part of the configuration Chairs in the drafting of resolutions concerning countries on the PBC's agenda. Their inclusion in that process by certain members of the Council is greatly appreciated, but it remains entirely informal and largely dependent

on the goodwill of the country in charge of a particular area.

Beyond that, I would like to suggest that the Security Council seriously consider issuing a standing invitation to the configuration Chairs to take part in briefings and consultations concerning their countries. For instance, I appreciate the opportunity to brief the Council on the situation in Burundi. I feel we could derive even more benefit if the exercise were interactive. Participation in consultations would considerably facilitate my work by giving me first-hand information and crucial analysis, enabling me to carry out my mandate more effectively. It would also allow members of the Security Council to ask me questions and get my opinion, should they need it.

The PBC's work is triangular, involving cooperation with the Governments of the countries on its agenda and with the United Nations on the ground. In the area of peacebuilding, the country-specific configurations can support not only the work of the Governments concerned but also of United Nations missions in the field under Security Council mandates. I believe that close cooperation between the executive and Special Representatives and the configuration Chairs is key to success. The Chairs can play a complementary role to that of the representatives of the Secretary-General and can help lighten their workload, without in any way acting as substitutes for the representatives in their role.

One final point should be considered in our efforts to strengthen the work of the PBC. Given that gathering information about the countries on the Commission's agenda remains a challenge for all the Chairs, more support from Peacebuilding Support Office and the Department of Political Affairs would be a welcome remedy. I fully understand that the Support Office has very limited human resources, and I would like to express my deep gratitude to them for their efforts. But simply making political analyses formally available through the Secretariat would greatly facilitate our work.

To conclude, almost seven years after the establishment of the Peacebuilding Commission and two years after its initial review, we find ourselves at a critical moment.

If the Security Council considers it to be a useful body, I believe that the time has come to invest more in it so as to extract its full potential. I welcome the opportunity to discuss that matter further tomorrow with all members of the Council during our interactive dialogue.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): I give the floor to the representative of Japan.

Mr. Yamazaki (Japan): I would like to offer my sincere congratulations to Colombia on its presidency of the Security Council and commend its decision to take up the important issue o ,ost-conflict peacebuilding.

Japan is a strong believer in peacebuilding. We have long stressed the need for seamless support, from peace and security to reconstruction and development, and have made peacebuilding one of the central pillars of our international cooperation. Although there is no doubt that national ownership is central to all processes of peacebuilding, we believe that regional cooperation and international support are crucial to ensuring an environment conducive to peace consolidation. With that in mind, Japan has attached great importance to the work of the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC). Japan has been a long-standing member of the Organizational Committee of the PBC, has served as Chair of the Commission, and is currently Chair of its Working Group on Lessons Learned.

Since its creation over six years ago, the Peacebuilding Commission has addressed the complex peacebuilding challenges faced by countries in the post-conflict phase. The role of the PBC is to facilitate and provide complementary support to the peace efforts of countries emerging from conflict through political accompaniment, the coordination of actors, and the marshaling of resources.

Despite the subtle and often low-profile nature of its work, the concrete impact of the PBC's support has been felt in the countries on its agenda, as was highlighted by Ambassador Abulkaram Abdul Momen, Chair of the PBC. Japan, as Chair of the Working Group on Lessons Learned since 2011, has endeavoured to extract lessons from the experiences of the countries of the country-specific configurations, as well as from those of other countries and regions. The Working Group has covered various topics that are crucial to peacebuilding efforts, including security sector reform, resource mobilization and youth employment, to name a few.

Despite those efforts, differences remain in the understanding of the work of the PBC, which needs to be overcome. Sharing a common understanding

is particularly important in light of the fact that the Commission draws its strength from a diverse membership, which allows it to leverage political, financial and technical capacities as it endeavours to align issues of peace and security with economic development.

In its meeting last December, the Working Group on Lessons Learned tried to address the need to share a common understanding among the different actors by focusing on the PBC's relationship with one of its crucial partners, the Security Council. The discussions at the meeting generated a number of concrete ideas with which to further pursue the interaction between those two entities, such as, inter alia, more frequent recourse by the Security Council to informal interactive dialogue with the country-specific configuration Chairs, and a possible adaptation of the Council's troop-contributing country meeting model to the interaction between the Council and the PBC.

Japan believes that the time has come to collectively consider some of the ways in which the country-specific configurations of the PBC could substantively contribute to the work of the Security Council. My delegation strongly hopes that today's deliberations will provide a timely and useful input to the discussions on that topic. For that, we are most grateful to the Colombian presidency.

We also recognize that there is room for the PBC to fully live up to its important mandated role. The PBC needs to be a forum in which the resources and attention of the international community are further enhanced for the countries on its agenda. The working methods of the PBC could be improved to make it easier for each of the Member States to actively take part in the work of the Commission. Greater synergies between the Commission and the Peacebuilding Fund, to which Japan is a major contributor, should be seriously pursued. Coordination among the United Nations system organizations would inevitably need to be addressed.

That having been said, we must not forget that the PBC is an evolving body. It should reflect, learn and adapt itself in order to achieve the ultimate goal of bringing a better and peaceful life to the people on the ground. It is the wish of the Government of Japan that today's open debate will be an important step in this evolving process. Japan remains strongly committed to the work of the Peacebuilding Commission, as it works in close cooperation with the Security Council.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): I give the floor to the representative of Burundi.

Mr. Ndabishuriye (Burundi) (*spoke in French*): Inscribed on the agenda of the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC) since it was first created, Burundi has benefitted from its significant support in a number of key areas, including political and institutional matters, the promotion of good governance, human rights and the state of law, the socio-economic reintegration of vulnerable groups, the mobilization and coordination of international aid, and regional integration.

With respect to political and institutional matters, a number of legal instruments have been put in place to clean up the political climate and improve institutional functioning. Among these, we note the law governing the organization and behaviour of political parties, the code of public administration and the law governing political opposition, which is before Parliament. We also note the establishment of a standing forum for dialogue among political partners

Concerning good governance, human rights and the rule of law, the PBC helped in the creation of several key mechanisms, such as the National Independent Human Rights Commission, in accordance with the Paris Principles, and the office of ombudsman and the Independent National Electoral Commission. Gender issues have also enjoyed substantial attention during all phases of institutional implementation, with the result that women currently make up 50 per cent of Parliament and 43 per cent of the Government.

Moreover, the penal code was reviewed to ensure that it addresses human rights violations and the protection of vulnerable groups. Among the results of that review, we would point out that just last month our prisons were emptied thanks to presidential pardons that benefitted a number of detainees.Despite their relevance to national reconciliation, certain transitional justice mechanisms, such as truth and reconciliation commissions, have not been put in place for lack of means.

The PBC did remarkable work in conceiving and financing the implementation of the national strategy for the socio-economic reintegration of people affected by conflict. Of that programme's $24 million budget, the PBC contributed $9.2 million. Arising from the

need to stabilize the country after more than a decade of conflict, that programme is aimed at demobilized former combatants, displaced persons, returnees, orphans, the war-wounded and all other people affected by conflict. To settle disputes over land and other matters resulting from the dark periods in Burundi's history, we established a commission on land and other property, which has already settled a great many claims.

On his regular, semi-annual visits to the country, the Chair of the Burundi configuration has more than once travelled to Arusha, the seat of the East African Community, where he has had useful exchanges with our partners in that subregional group about helping Burundi with its post-conflict issues. I take this opportunity to thank Ambassador Paul Seger, Chair of the Burundi configuration, for the deep commitment he has always demonstrated to the cause of Burundi. We well know the critical work he is currently doing to move international public opinion towards participating in the next donors' conference in order to help Burundi in its fight against poverty.

To conclude, my delegation would like to ask the Council to continue supporting the PBC and to promote more active interaction between the Council and the PBC. It would be mutually instructive for the Chairs of the configurations and the countries on the PBC's agenda to be systematically invited to Council meetings whenever an agenda item concerns them.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): I now give the floor to the representative of Liberia.

Mr. Dennis (Liberia): Permit me, at the outset, to express my warm appreciation to the Security Council, and in particular to the presidency of the Council for this month, Colombia, for convening this important debate on post- conflict peacebuilding. I also commend the Secretary-General, as well as Mr. Abulkalam Abdul Momen, Chair of the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC), for their respective statements. Similarly, I would like to welcome Ms. María Ángela Holguín Cuéllar, the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Colombia. Her presence here to personally preside over this debate is a clear indication of the importance Colombia attaches to post-conflict peacebuilding.

The fifth report of the PBC (S/2012/70) shows that the PBC is a work in progress, as it builds on the activities undertaken in previous years. I commend Ambassador Gasana, under whose leadership the report was prepared, and I thank him for his statement. We take note of the 2012 road map and wish to express our gratitude to the Commission for its commitment to sustaining peace.

Military interventions in the form of peacekeeping missions have a crucial stabilizing effect. That does not necessarily mean, however, that peace in all its aspects is achieved when peacekeepers are deployed to placate a violent situation. While such interventions do end violence and create a stable environment for civility and order, real and tangible peace is realized when basic structures, institutions and capacities are restored.

Post-conflict peacebuilding is a demanding task. It is time-consuming, requires tremendous human endeavour and exacts massive financial resources. The reason, as we all know, is that conflicts leave in their aftermath colossal destruction of basic economic and social structures, a lack of basic safety and security, justice and the rule of law, deficient financial resources and limited institutional capacity. Addressing those mammoth problems requires a profound understanding of the conflict situation. Post-conflict peacebuilding should endeavour to address the underlying causes of the conflict. The strategies required to secure a stable and an enduring peace must be ingrained first and foremost in encouraging political will, an inclusive process of identification and prioritization of the peacebuilding imperatives and ensuring national ownership and leadership of the peacebuilding effort.

Beyond the expertise required to address peacebuilding initiatives, including collaboration with national partners, international institutions, Member States and regional groups, funding peacebuilding initiatives has been a critical challenge. The role of the international community is most crucial in addressing that challenge.

The PBC was created only a few years ago, and there are already important lessons that can be drawn from its activities. Through the country configurations and the support of the Peacebuilding Support Office, the Commission is breaking new ground for engagement, in synergy with national leadership and relevant stakeholders, which can be used to guide its future interventions. Undoubtedly, the PBC's engagement with the countries on its agenda has produced concrete benefits. In the case of Liberia, the PBC's engagement has been very constructive. In the targeted areas of the rule of law, security sector reform and national reconciliation, significant progress has been made. In

the rule of law sector, judicial reform is taking place, and a land reform commission has been established. Courts are being rehabilitated, magistrates trained and pre-trial detention has decreased. Under security sector reform, progress has been made aimed at establishing a credible security presence throughout the country. A national security reform and intelligence act intended to rationalize the security sector has been adopted. Justice and security hubs are being constructed with the aim of decentralizing security and ensuring access to justice. The first hub is ready for operation, and plans are under way to begin the construction on the second hub. Police reform is ongoing, and significant progress has been made.

We have recently been concentrating on national reconciliation, and a validation exercise on the strategic road map for reconciliation is now taking place. The road map aligns national reconciliation with the implementation of the country's national vision. National identity and national healing have been highlighted as primary concerns for national cohesion. We acknowledge the decisive role of the Peacebuilding Fund and the Peacebuilding Support Office in those achievements.

In conclusion, the United Nations must be applauded for according post-conflict peacebuilding the importance and urgency it deserves, especially in the past decade. Its approach embodies the realization and recognition that, while peacekeeping, especially in a violent conflict, prevents further carnage, sustaining the peace is critical to maintaining stability in post-conflict and fragile countries and to avoiding relapse into conflict. Support for the PBC is therefore crucial. We believe that that support should begin with enhanced interaction between the Commission and the Council, as such interaction will narrow the information gap and allow the Council to take advantage of the PBC's expertise and advice.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): I now give the floor to the representative of Sierra Leone.

Mr. Kamara (Sierra Leone): Let me at the outset thank the Colombian presidency for convening today's meeting. Let me also thank the Secretary-General for his very instructive statement.

Sierra Leone warmly welcomes the report of the Peacebuilding Commission on its fifth session (S/2012/70), which accurately reflects, inter alia, the work of the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC) in Sierra Leone. We appreciate the continued support of the PBC's country configurations for countries on the Commission's agenda, which have provided political advocacy and support, fostered coherence among key actors and intensified efforts aimed at resource mobilization.

The initiation of activities by the Commission to strengthen its impact and give added value, both in the field and as a policy platform for the development of United Nations peacebuilding norms and more, is commendable.

In that context, we encourage the Commission to continue interacting with international financial institutions, regional organizations and operational actors of the United Nations system in order to strengthen partnerships and coordinate activities with a view towards enhancing complementarity and coherence among actors in the countries on the agenda. That is important, as it has the potential to strengthen the Commission's efforts in political advocacy, resource mobilization and addressing transnational organized crime and drug trafficking.

The adoption of statements of mutual commitments in Liberia and Guinea as the new instruments for engagement underscores the advantages of a single overarching planning document that sets forth well-defined peacebuilding elements. It is also a step towards adapting to the changing needs of the countries on the PBC agenda. Along those lines, the Commission should take into account the transitional phases of peacebuilding and seamlessly adopt appropriate forms of engagement at every phase.

We urge the Commission to continue building on its contributions to the work of the Senior Advisory Group, in particular in improving the United Nations contribution to strengthening national capacities for peacebuilding. The fundamental principle of national ownership and the importance of supporting nationally driven processes, including civilian capacity development and institution- building, will no doubt broaden and deepen the pool of civilian expertise in peacebuilding in the immediate aftermath of conflict. In that regard, the Commission should monitor and make recommendations on the implementation of the Secretary-General's civilian capacity review and assess its practical implications for national capacity-building in critical peacebuilding priority areas.

It is clear that countries emerging from conflict need an institution like the PBC to serve as a platform to support them with advice and assistance to raise their profile internationally, build trust and dialogue among the various national stakeholders and mobilize financial resources for immediate and long-term peacebuilding priorities, including support for democratic and governance institutions.

However, the PBC's record on resource mobilization remains mixed. In that regard, the PBC should consider what the appropriate goals in the area of resource mobilization should be, including whether it can also make a contribution in other areas, such as aid management, aid coordination, technical assistance and outreach to the philanthropic and private sectors. In that respect, the wider membership of the Peacebuilding Commission should work with it to identify clearer ways in which they can concretely contribute to peacebuilding in the countries on the agenda.

The role of the Peacebuilding Support Office remains crucial for the Commission's efficient functioning by providing assistance in the development of instruments of engagement and the assessment of progress achieved in meeting commitments made therein, as well as unblocking obstacles and identifying opportunities for resource mobilization.

Sierra Leone was placed on the PBC's agenda on 23 June 2006, following a referral from the Security Council. To date, the PBC has worked with the Government and with international and local partners to address the country's peacebuilding priorities. Since then, our engagement with the PBC has been fruitful, and as noted in the PBC report, the Commission, working through the Sierra Leone configuration, has made tremendous progress in its peacebuilding efforts, chiefly through aligning the peacebuilding elements of the Agenda for Change with the joint vision of the United Nations country team and resource mobilization efforts.

The Agenda for Change provides a strong partnership link between Sierra Leone, the United Nations and the donor community. Its implementation has so far had a great impact on peacebuilding and in laying the foundation for opening the path to sustainable development and peace consolidation. Furthermore, through the country-specific configuration and the United Nations Integrated Peacebuilding Office in Sierra Leone, the PBC has provided a platform for enhanced dialogue among political parties and all national stakeholders with a clear commitment to ensuring durable peace and stability. Sierra Leone's approach is considered today to be a best practice in the area of donor coordination.

Through engagement with the PBC, the Peacebuilding Fund released about $35 million in 2007 as catalytic funding to support well-defined peacebuilding initiatives, including reparations for war victims, the establishment of the Human Rights Commission, the provision of emergency support to the energy sector, youth enterprise development, good governance and the rule of law, and the delivery of public services. That funding was followed by a second envelope of $7 million, which was dedicated, inter alia, to enhancing political dialogue and the participation of civil society in the political process leading up to the 2012 elections. Those programmes of support essentially contributed to creating visible peace dividends, and their impact on peacebuilding is invaluable. We therefore urge Member States that are in a position to contribute to the Peacebuilding Fund (PBF) to invest in achieving durable peace and stability.

Clearly, the role of the PBC, with support from the PBSO and the PBF, remains crucial in preventing countries from relapsing into conflict. There is, however, a need to develop more synergy between the PBF, the PBSO and the PBC.

The New Deal, recently agreed in Busan, as well as the publication of the *World Development Report 2011* and ongoing work on peacebuilding at the United Nations, provide an opportunity for countries undergoing transition or post-conflict recovery to have their voices, perspectives and needs better heard at the United Nations. The Peacebuilding Commission as a whole should serve as a global platform for these discussions, while the country-specific configurations should provide political support for field-level implementation.

The Chair of the Sierra Leone country-configuration, Ambassador Guillermo Rishchynski, visited Sierra Leone in January. His report and briefing of the configuration underscored progress made in addressing key peacebuilding priorities and the need for enduring support, particularly in the area of youth unemployment and empowerment, building police capacity, and the need for strong private sector growth that could translate into more tangible peace dividends

and sustainable peace consolidation. We believe that the Security Council team that visited Sierra Leone in May also shares similar views on progress made and the need for support to address present challenges.

Let me, at this juncture, express Sierra Leone's gratitude to the Chair and members of the Sierra Leone configuration, as well as other international partners, for their unreserved commitment to achieving Sierra Leone's peacebuilding objectives, along with our development transformation goals.

In conclusion, as one of the first countries on the PBC's agenda, Sierra Leone has charted a path for others to potentially learn from. This has involved adjusting early approaches in order to make more effective use of PBF resources, lower the bureaucratic burden placed on Government, and better align United Nations efforts with national priorities. It has also entailed a shift in perspective away from heavy field-level engagement with an operational focus to a more political role that concentrates on how the PBC can serve as an international platform for advocacy and action on all aspects of peacebuilding.

Finally, strengthening peacebuilding will better enable countries to avoid relapsing into conflict and to sustain peace beyond the life of peacekeeping missions. It will also ensure that the enormous investments that Member States make in peacekeeping will achieve their intended results. In its short existence, the peacebuilding architecture has proven its worth, as envisaged by the leaders at the 2005 World Summit, whose goal was to help countries emerging from conflict make an irreversible transition from war to sustainable peace.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): I now give the floor to the representative of Chile.

Mr. Errázuriz (Chile) (*spoke in Spanish*): My delegation congratulates you, Madam, on your Colombia's presidency of the Security Council for this month, and expresses its gratitude for the invitation to participate in this debate, which will contribute to strengthened relations between the Council and the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC).

We also thank the Secretary-General and the representatives of the World Bank and the African Development Bank for their statements. Their participation clearly demonstrates the importance of partnerships with entities that participate on the ground and provide a regional view.

I also thank Ambassador Eugène-Richard Gasana, Permanent Representative of Rwanda, for his statement as Chair of the Peacebuilding Commission for 2011. We appreciate the thorough report on the activities of the PBC during its fifth session (S/2012/70). We also appreciate the statement made by Mr. Momen, Permanent Representative of Bangladesh and current Chair of the PBC, for the very valuable information provided on the work of the Commission in the past year.

We acknowledge the work of the Chairs of the country-specific configurations and express our appreciation of the work of Ms. Judy Cheng-Hopkins, Assistant Secretary-General for Peacebuilding Support, and her Office for their assistance to the PBC and its various configurations.

My delegation associates itself with the statement to be made by the Permanent Representative of Tunisia in his country's capacity as coordinator of the States members of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries for the Peacebuilding Commission.

My delegation recognizes the significant efforts undertaken to advance the implementation of the recommendations set forth in the 2010 review (S/2010/393, annex), in particular progress in the interaction between the Commission and the main United Nations organs, especially the Security Council.

My delegation would like to highlight the important participation of the Chairs of the respective configurations and the representatives of the countries involved in the discussion of the mandates of a political mission or peacekeeping operation. Nevertheless, my country believes that there is still room for ongoing progress in that direction and, in a fluid and informal context, for the discussion of peacebuilding issues of interest to the Security Council. In that regard, it may be possible to assess that relationship within the Working Group on Peacekeeping Operations. While these are two completely different aspects of the process in post-conflict countries, they are also two sides of the same coin. Chile reaffirms the need to put into institutional practice the recommendations of the 2010 review, which point to the need for a more informal and fluid relationship with the Security Council.

On a different note, my country highlights the work done over the past year with respect to global, regional, subregional and international organizations, especially the partnership established with the African

Development Bank and the closer ties with the World Bank. My delegation believes these steps to be particularly important in the Commission's outreach efforts. Moreover, we highlight the high-level meeting of post-conflict countries that took place in Rwanda last November. The experiences of such countries are critical inputs to the work of the Peacebuilding Commission.

Women and young people are at the heart of the Commission's activities, and have been since its inception. Chile values the meeting with the Executive Board of UN Women and supports its conclusions, especially with regard to activating a dialogue with UN Women at the level of specific configurations concerning priorities that will promote the greater participation of women in peacebuilding processes from the outset.

The Commission's report rightly points to the current international financial situation, which is already having an impact on aid flows to the countries on the PBC's agenda. With a view to mitigating the effects of the crisis, Chile believes that it is important to study ways to promote a deeper relationship and to strengthen joint initiatives with the private sector.

Finally, we urge the Commission to continue working on the development of a communications strategy that will make it possible to disseminate information to a greater number of institutions and people concerning the work and objectives of the Commission.

My country believes that the PBC is the best platform for intergovernmental advice, leadership, and the development of peacebuilding expertise and practices.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): I now give the floor to the Head of the Delegation of the European Union.

Mr. Mayr-Harting (European Union): I have the honour to speak on behalf of the European Union (EU) and its member States.

The acceding country Croatia; the candidate countries the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Montenegro, Iceland and Serbia; the countries of the Stabilisation and Association Process and potential candidates Albania and Bosnia and Herzegovina; as well as Ukraine, the Republic of Moldova, Armenia and Georgia, align themselves with this statement.

I thank you, Madam President, for having organized today's important debate revolving around the report of the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC) on its fifth session (S/2012/70). We were grateful for the Secretary-General's statement, and I would like in particular to thank the former and current Chairs of the Peacebuilding Commission, Ambassadors Gasana and Momen, respectively, for their statements and for everything they have done and are doing in the interests of peacebuilding. I also thank the Colombian presidency for having put forward the concept note for today's discussion (S/2012/511, annex).

It is important to take stock at least once a year of the activities carried out by the Peacebuilding Commission. This is a healthy exercise to assess the achievements registered over the past months, to draw lessons learned from the shortcomings, and to further elaborate on the immediate challenges requiring our collective attention.

In terms of progress, we should note that during the period under review, the PBC carried out a series of important outreach activities and that the coherence between it and the Peacebuilding Fund has been strengthened in some cases. The report also portrays some positive developments achieved by the continued engagement of the country-specific configurations in supporting the six countries on the PBC agenda. The configurations, whose work is very important, have endeavoured to provide political guidance aimed at coherence among key players pursuing nationally owned peacebuilding priorities.

The placement of Guinea on the PBC agenda in February last year and the progress witnessed thus far in that country on security sector reform, on the launch of a pension scheme for 4,000 military personnel with the Peacebuilding Fund, and on deployment of civilian expertise, as well as the appointment of an advisor on security sector reform, are also positive steps.

Still, great challenges ahead remain. Our determined efforts to release the PBC's full potential to overcome those challenges needs to continue. Important test cases are the November elections in Sierra Leone and national reconciliation in Liberia. The situation in Guinea-Bissau is also extremely precarious, and we need to step up our efforts for a return of constitutional normalcy and to loosen the military grip on civilian power through a genuine security sector reform process.

We believe that the PBC has a key role to play in those areas.

We believe that the PBC is now in a second critical phase of its life, and there is need to re-energize political commitment to that body. In this context, we fully welcome some encouraging developments witnessed recently. For instance, the recent meeting of the PBC Chairs' Group and the meeting of the Executive or Special Representatives of the Secretary-General of PBC countries was an excellent initiative to have a frank discussion on how to reinvigorate the relationship between both. We sincerely hope that this dialogue will continue in the future.

We are also very grateful to the United Kingdom for having put forward a thoughtful non-paper aimed at strengthening the role of the PBC and seeking a more interactive relationship with the Council. The benefits of an enhanced and more organic relationship between the Security Council and the PBC are increasingly being recognized, and the potential exists to create a new dynamic between a more forthcoming Security Council and a better-performing Peacebuilding Commission. We also hope that the interactive dialogue between the PBC Chairs and Council members scheduled for tomorrow may bring issues forward.

Similarly, we are also buoyed by the dynamics surrounding the PBC configuration of Liberia, including through the appointment of a new full-time Chair and a new Special Representative of the Security-General in Monrovia. This should facilitate a common understanding of both roles and a good complementarity with the New Deal initiative of the g7+.

Finally, we are very glad to acknowledge that peacebuilding and prevention figure prominently in the action agenda set out by the Secretary-General for his second term. In that context, we look forward to the Secretary-General's upcoming report on post-conflict peacebuilding, due at a later stage this year.

Having said this, let us not forget the most important aspect – national ownership. Peacebuilding will succeed only if it is home-grown and nationally led. Our duty as the international community must consist in aligning behind nationally owned strategies.

To conclude, peacebuilding is a very complex and multifaceted challenge. It is a work in progress, and we are still learning by doing. In this context, we firmly believe that the PBC has a pivotal role to play. Its strength comes directly from its nature as the unique intergovernmental advisory body to the Security Council, but so do its limitations as a New York-based platform.

The EU and its member states stand ready to continue supporting efforts to enable the United Nations peacebuilding architecture to live up to the expectations that accompanied its establishment, and I wish to assure the Council of the commitment of the European Union and its member States to the continued work of the Peacebuilding Commission.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): I now give the floor to the representative of Belgium.

Mr. Grauls (Belgium) (*spoke in French*): I would like to thank you, Madam President, for the opportunity to address the Security Council during this important debate on post-conflict peacebuilding.

Belgium aligns itself with the statement that has just been made on behalf of the European Union.

I will not elaborate on the annual report (S/2012/70) of the Peacebuilding Commission, which provides a factual overview of the activities of the Commission and its configurations, but I would like to focus on the relationship between the Security Council and the Peacebuilding Commission, which relates to the third question in the concept note. The few points I want to share with members of the Security Council are inspired by my previous role as Chair of the Peacebuilding Commission country-specific configuration for the Central African Republic.

Looking back at the past few years, one has to conclude that relations between the Security Council and the Peacebuilding Commission can without doubt be significantly improved. This relationship has certainly not yet achieved its full potential and could be deepened and enriched by a greater interest on the part of the Council in the activities of the Commission and its various configurations. I sincerely believe that the activities of the Peacebuilding Commission deserve more attention on the part of the Council. In that regard, Belgium strongly welcomes the relevant ideas submitted by the United Kingdom in the non-paper that has been circulated.

I would like to underline three points for a strengthened relationship between the Security Council and the Peacebuilding Commission. The first concerns the possible role of the Commission, and especially

its configurations, in the preparatory phase of the deliberations that the Council holds on countries on its agenda. The second concerns the role played by the Commission and its configurations in the follow-up to the Council's deliberations. The third and last point is about the relationship between the Commission and the subsidiary organs of the Council, which is often neglected.

First and foremost, I am convinced that the Security Council could pay more attention to the work of the Peacebuilding Commission in the preparatory phase of its own deliberations on a country on its agenda. During that phase, the Council could in particular address concrete requests for the opinion of the Chairs of the various country-specific configurations on such topics as disarmament, demobilization and reintegration, security sector reform, socio-economic development, gaps in the peacebuilding agenda or any other issue concerning peacebuilding. This would in turn allow the Chairs to make more relevant and certainly more specific contributions and to offer greater added value when addressing the Council.

My experience with the Central African Republic taught me that it is extremely useful for a configuration to visit the country a few weeks ahead of the Council's deliberations. Such visits, at the right moment and carefully timed to the Council's agenda, would allow configurations to brief the Council as accurately as possible on the issues that the Council would have already asked it to investigate in detail. I do not see why the Council could not suggest that a configuration Chair travel to the country in question ahead of a discussion in the Council. The Council could also ask Chairs to focus on specific questions linked to peacebuilding during their visits on the ground. It is clear that advice given on this basis by configurations could end up in the resolutions and decisions that the Council often adopts at the end of its deliberations. One is forced to conclude that the peacebuilding dimension is still too often omitted from the Council's decisions.

This brings me to my second point. My experience as Chair of the Central African Republic configuration has taught me that any reference to peacebuilding in a Security Council decision helps to reinforce the work of the configuration and is also taken very seriously by the country under consideration.

I therefore take this opportunity to urge that more references to peacebuilding concerns be included more frequently in the Council's decisions. The configuration Chairs could also function as an echo of the Council's decisions during their visits to the countries concerned and pass on its policy messages through their contact with the countries' authorities. This would also improve coherence between the configuration and the Council-mandated United Nations missions on the ground. We have learned from experience that in some cases senior United Nations representatives on the ground do not share the views of configuration members. Coordinated guidance from the Council could help to avoid such situations.

Lastly, I would like to briefly emphasize that there is room for improvement in the cooperation between the Peacebuilding Commission and other subsidiary organs of the Security Council. On several occasions, as Chair of the country-specific configuration for the Central African Republic, I briefed the Council's Working Group on Children and Armed Conflict on the findings of my visits on the ground. This relationship between configurations and some of the Council's subsidiary organs is still too often neglected. In the same spirit, I had very close contact with the Special Representatives of the Secretary-General for Children and Armed Conflict and on Sexual Violence in Conflict. I am convinced that such interaction was very useful and should even be intensified.

In conclusion, I reaffirm my conviction that the critical relationship between the Council and the Peacebuilding Commission can be considerably strengthened, and that any initiative to that end on the part of the Security Council would be greatly appreciated by the configurations.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): I now give the floor to the representative of Croatia.

Mr. Vilović (Croatia): My delegation aligns itself with the statement delivered on behalf of the European Union a few minutes ago, but I would also like to make some brief remarks in my national capacity.

Let me begin by thanking the Secretary-General for his thoughtful remarks on this important issue. I would also like to thank Ambassador Gasana, former Chair of the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC), for his able leadership of the Commission in 2011 and introduction of the report of the Commission on its fifth session (S/2012/70), as well as the current Chair, Ambassador Momen, for his remarks, which we agree with fully.

Finally, let me thank the representative of the World Bank for his valuable insights and contributions.

The PBC report that we are discussing today, especially where it touches on the country-specific configurations, is testament to the Commission's ongoing effort to support national actors in taking full ownership of and leading the peacebuilding process in their countries. As reflected in the outcome of the first review, in 2010, of the United Nations peacebuilding architecture (S/2010/393, annex), the PBC's main tasks can be summarized in three major areas: political accompaniment, resource mobilization and coordination. Accordingly, the Commission's accomplishments in these areas should serve as a basis for thorough analysis of its achievements in the most recent reporting period, as well as for evaluating its contribution and added value.

In that regard, it is essential to start with the important work of the Commission's operative components, the country-specific configurations. Their considerable achievements in the area of political rapprochement, electoral process, capacity development and institution-building are undeniable, although, it sometimes seems, not always advertised enough. Furthermore, the Commission's notable efforts to achieve more substantial engagement in peacebuilding activities on the part of international financial institutions, and to incorporate peacebuilding needs and priorities into the development agenda deserve full recognition and more support.

All those achievements testify to the Commission's ambition and ability to serve as a political platform for nationally owned prioritization, mobilizing highly needed support in whatever form it may come, and maintaining a continuing international focus on national peacebuilding priorities and goals.

At the same time, I would like to stress the importance that Croatia attaches to new, inclusive and representative global partnerships, bringing together traditional donors and new ones, who often share experience similar to that of the nations they are ready to support. In that regard, we closely follow emerging new initiatives and related pilot projects aimed at further promoting South-South and triangular cooperation, and efforts to develop appropriate indicators to help measure progress in priority areas, as well as to advance issues relating to accountability, transparency and a result-oriented approach. We hope that mutual influences and possible interaction between such initiatives and activities of the PBC and its configurations will inject new enthusiasm and vitality into ongoing and future peacebuilding efforts.

In that context, and bearing in mind the particular importance of capacity-building in countries emerging from conflict, let me add that Croatia attaches significant importance to the follow-up to the recent civilian capacity review and the establishment of CapMatch, a global platform aimed at producing more demand-oriented, partnership-based, flexible and effective mechanisms for the transfer of civilian skills and knowledge to national actors. We consider the re-establishment of those skills and that knowledge at the national level to be a crucial component of every post-conflict peacebuilding effort, and one of the major guarantees that fragile societies will not slide back into conflict and desperation. We are particularly interested in seeing that platform function efficiently in all the countries on the PBC's agenda. Croatia will do its part in that regard.

With regard to the Commission's performance at Headquarters and its relations with key actors, including the principal United Nations organs and operational bodies, it is clear that that area, which has been somewhat neglected, needs further deliberations and will benefit, it is to be hoped, from considerable improvement. For example, it is obvious that the Commission, by providing its opinion and advice on established priority areas in the countries on its agenda, could significantly contribute to the Council's analysis, deliberations and final decisions, especially during preparations for the Council's visits to those countries, as well as to the establishment of mandates, their renewal or alteration, and to other decisions regarding the United Nations engagement in those countries. In that regard, we fully support requests for further strengthening the relationship between the Council and the Commission and its appropriate institutionalization.

One good starting point, as suggested by Ambassador Momen in his statement, would be periodic information- sharing meetings between the Council and country-specific configurations, which should be held quarterly.

At the same time, it has become obvious, that, as the concept note states, in this "crowded and somewhat fragmented field of operational actors in the countries on its agenda" (*S/2012/511, annex, para. 11*), there needs

to be a clearly articulated division of labour and mutual cooperation among different components of the United Nations presence on the ground. Such an approach would not only render the United Nations messages and engagement more focused and efficient, but show leadship by example in that rather difficult component of international assistance, and the United Nations would strengthen its credibility and fully reaffirm its leading role.

I will conclude by quoting the Secretary-General, who recently said that peacebuilding is a task involving many actors, and I am tempted to add, "a task with many faces". Only through genuine political commitment on the part of Governments, especially those participating in the diverse membership of the PCB, non-governmental organizations, the private sector and local society, and by bearing in mind that no one solution fits all situations, can we hope to seize the right moment and choose the right tools in order to help societies leave their troubles behind and find a brighter and more advantageous future.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): I now give the floor to the representative of Australia.

Mr. Quinlan (Australia): I would like to thank you, Madam President, for convening this debate. We welcome the statements from the previous speakers, including the interventions from Ambassadors Momen and Gasana. We agree with the assessment that the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC) has yet to meet its full potential and that we need to do better. We support the ideas put forward in relation to the relationship between the PBC and the Security Council and also the interesting point — made, I believe, by the representative of Germany — that the link between the PBC's work and the post-2015 development agenda should be strengthened.

I would like to focus on three areas that we see as critical to the work of the Commission going forward.

The first is enhancing the Commission's impact in the field, which was obviously one of the over-arching themes of the 2010 review, which is easy to talk about but very difficult to achieve, as we know. Obviously, building better linkages with actors in the field — the "many faces" — is an important part of the solution. The PBC must look at how it can best support the work of United Nations missions and country teams — the Special Representatives of the Secretary-General, the executive representatives of the Secretary-General and the Resident Coordinators. The relationships between country configurations and field actors need much more clarification and strengthening.

We must ensure that policy discussions here in New York translate into practical coordination on the ground and also reflect realities on the ground. As Member States, we need to maintain dialogue with all elements of the United Nations system to ensure coherence. We must look carefully at the PBC's comparative advantages. They include its advocacy role and its nature as a Member State-based organization with a unique composition. The PBC has an ability to convene diverse stakeholders. It needs to look at more active engagement of multilateral, bilateral and regional actors, including in the field.

Resource mobilization is also vital to increasing the impact in the field, that is very difficult, of course; it is the most difficult aspect of all. The new approach taken by the PBC and the peacebuilding force in Liberia, in developing an Expanded Priority Plan linked to the Statement of Mutual Commitments, seems very instructive. We encourage country configurations to map international assistance and to find more effective avenues for support from funding partners.

My second point is the importance of supporting national ownership, which must be the central organizing principle. The PBC has shown time and again that it works best when it is working in support of nationally determined priorities. We support efforts to better and more specifically define commitments between the PBC and countries on its agenda, to make them more measurable and align them more closely with national priorities. We welcome efforts in New York to involve the permanent representatives of the countries on the PBC's agenda more deeply in the Commission's policy work.

My third point relates to the relationship between the Security Council and the PBC. We have consistently urged a closer and more organic relationship between those two bodies. We welcome positive steps in that regard, including enhanced involvement of PBC country configurations in Council discussions. We would encourage more informal dialogue between the Council and the Peacebuilding Commission, and we very much welcome the interactive dialogue to be held tomorrow as an opportunity for frank discussion. The Council, as one of the PBC's parent organs, should set out clearly its expectations, particularly in relation to

the PBC's advisory role. The Council could make better use of that advisory role, including when it comes to mandate renewals and periods of transition in the United Nations engagement in a country. There is also a role for the PBC in early warning to the Council. As the South African representative remarked earlier, the advice of the PBC should be used at all times when it is relevant.

As Ambassador Momen has emphasized, the PBC needs to be a collective enterprise. My own country is trying to play its part. We were, in fact, the first donor to the Peacebuilding Fund, and I would like to announce a new contribution of $12 million today. We have contributed other amounts in support of the country-specific configurations and made other contributions. There are more details in the statement that I have circulated. I would mention only that in order to help ensure that the PBC is better able to measure impact in the field and to share peacebuilding lessons from our region — the Asia-Pacific — we have produced a report on peacekeeping lessons, focusing on the mistakes my own country made when it sought to help with peacebuilding in Bougainville in the Solomon Islands in Papua New Guinea. That publication was launched last month in New York and is available outside the room.

To conclude, let me say that we take seriously our role in the collective enterprise of building peace. I would like to assure the Council of our ongoing commitment to ensuring that the PBC continues to develop so that it can deliver genuine change to the lives of people in countries emerging from conflict.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): I now give the floor to the representative of Tunisia.

Mr. Jerandi (Tunisia): I have the honour to speak on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement regarding the activities of the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC).

I would like, at the outset, to thank you, Madam President, for organizing this important meeting. I also thank the Secretary-General, His Excellency Mr. Abulkalam Abdul Momen, Permanent Representative of Bangladesh and Chair of the PBC, and Ambassador Eugène-Richard Gusana, the outgoing Chair, for their respective statements.

The Non-Aligned Movement welcomes the opportunity to participate in this open debate so that it can reiterate its strong support for the PBC and its commitment to contribute actively to setting a more coherent and integrated peacebuilding agenda.

The Movement notes with appreciation that the fifth report of the Peacebuilding Commission (S/2012/70) reflects the progress made so far in taking forward recommendations contained in the report (S/2010/393, annex) of the co-facilitators on the 2010 review process. The Movement also welcomes the ambitious 2012 road map of actions being implemented under the leadership of Ambassador Momen.

Nevertheless, we must recognize, as reflected in the report, that the PBC still faces some important challenges. They include intensifying the nexus between peace and development by further prioritizing economic revitalization and the social dimension of development, entrenching principles of national ownership and developing national capacities. The Commission is also challenged to increase its tangible impact in the field, guaranteeing well-coordinated and coherent actions on the ground and ensuring faster and predictable financing for recovery activities over the medium to long term.

We are also convinced that much more still needs to be done to ensure that peacebuilding is a United Nations-centric term. In that regard, the Movement welcomes the fact that the reporting period witnessed growing interest in the work of the PBC by Member States.

The Movement believes that that growing interest must lead to closer, dynamic and substantive interaction between the PBC and the Security Council, the General Assembly and the Economic and Social Council. Such close interaction will make the United Nations react and deliver as one body when it comes to setting the peacebuilding agenda, on the basis of a better integrated and coherent approach, strengthening joint planning and providing clear definitions of actors' responsibilities, as well as exhaustive details on the respective portfolios to avoid overlap and duplication.

Better coordination of United Nations strategies, actions and messaging indeed requires building stronger synergies between the PBC and other key United Nations bodies, including the operational ones, while maximizing synergies with the Peacebuilding Fund, so that the PBC can play a pivotal role in setting the general policy of the Fund to avoid any gaps in mobilizing resources. To that end, we need to focus our attention on the role of the PBC in providing the

United Nations with policy guidelines and strategies on its peacebuilding activities, to further strengthen interlinkages between security and development.

With its unique membership structure, which includes Member States serving in key United Nations bodies and representing many geographical regions of the world, the Peacebuilding Commission is positioned to be a platform of coordination and of sharing experiences and knowledge, thereby assisting countries in devising and sequencing their own priorities and fulfilling those priorities in the best possible way. In that regard, the PBC should give special attention to the necessity of developing national capacities and further reinforcing institution-building, through the mechanisms and the financial and technical resources needed to do so.

Re-energizing the political support and commitment of Member States is fundamental to realizing the full potential of the PBC, especially as it is exploring the expansion of its agenda. As underlined by the co-facilitators' report on the 2010 review, the review should be a wake-up call to strengthen the collective resolve to deal with peacebuilding in a more comprehensive and determined way.

The unique membership structure of the PBC makes that body a credible actor that the Security Council can rely on in addressing conflict issues. The fact that 9 of the 15 members of the Security Council are currently members of the PBC's Organizational Committee further facilitates a dynamic linkage between the Commission and the Council. In that regard, the Movement reiterates its stress on the following elements relating to the Commission's advisory role with the Security Council.

First, the PBC could play a major role in drawing the Council's attention to situations that might constitute threats to peace and security, especially with regard to the countries on its agenda. It could also benchmark the progression from stabilization to sustainable peace in those countries.

Secondly, the Council should ensure the full participation of the PBC in all discussions falling under the Commission's competencies. That would help the Security Council in effectively playing its critical role in initiating peacebuilding processes in critical areas at an earlier stage.

Thirdly, the prevention role of the PBC should be among the principal pillars of its activities and be further explored. We are convinced that there is room for the Council to take advantage of the full potential preventive role of the existing PBC mandate.

Fourthly, the work of the country-specific configurations must be fully jelled with the overall United Nations objectives of building sustainable peace in the aftermath of conflict by, inter alia, ensuring complete national ownership of all peacebuilding initiatives. The Chairs of the configurations should be provided an opportunity to brief the Security Council and the Organizational Committee of the PBC, to ensure participation and accountability.

Finally, let me reiterate that the Non-Aligned Movement remains strongly committed to supporting the Peacebuilding Commission's efforts in promoting sustainable peace.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): I now give the floor to the representative of the Republic of Korea.

Mr. Shin Dong Ik (Republic of Korea): I would like to begin by expressing my sincere appreciation to you, Madam President, for the convening of today's open debate on post-conflict peacebuilding. My appreciation and warm welcome also goes to Ambassador Eugène-Richard Gasana of Rwanda, former Chair of the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC), as well as the Commission's current Chair, Ambassador Abulkalam Abdul Momen of Bangladesh, and Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon. I thank them for their statements today. In addition, it is timely and productive to have Mr. Joachim von Amsberg, World Bank Vice-President, participating in today's debate. I believe that this debate will serve to increase understanding of the nature and scope of the PBC's role.

Over the past six years, the Peacebuilding Commission has steadily developed effective methods to carry out its mandates by catalyzing international efforts to assist countries emerging from conflict situations. The fifth annual report of the Commission (S/2012/70), which was prepared through close consultation among Member States and the Peacebuilding Support Office, offers a clear synopsis of the achievements made and the challenges faced by the Commission during its fifth session. That is an important leap ahead, as the report now reflects, for the first time, the progress made in moving forward the relevant recommendations contained in the co-facilitators' report entitled "Review of the United Nations peacebuilding architecture" (S/2010/393, annex).

Peacebuilding operations should be executed in such a way as to further strengthen and respect national ownership and the priorities of recipient countries. The ultimate goal of peacebuilding is not only to stabilize the post-conflict situation but also to establish a basis for long-term sustainable development. The PBC has had many achievements in the field of political support and advocacy. For example, it has been able to support national capacity development for law enforcement in Liberia since 2011. It also provided effective support to the first round of presidential elections in Guinea-Bissau last March, despite the military coup afterwards, which should be strongly condemned and reversed, as resolution 2048 (2012) articulates. In addition, my delegation would like to stress that strengthening civilian capacity in the aftermath of conflict is also critical for achieving and maintaining sustained peace.

The partnership among all stakeholders, within and outside the United Nations system, should also be strengthened, with the PBC playing the role of a facilitator. Particularly, the strategic partnerships of the United Nations with international and regional financial institutions, such as the World Bank and the African Development Bank, are imperative in securing financial resources and effective budget allocation. The recent completion of new poverty reduction strategies in Burundi and the Central African Republic offer a prime opportunity for strengthening the United Nations partnership with the World Bank and the African Development Bank.

Closer linkage and coordination between the Security Council and the Peacebuilding Commission is necessary for carrying out peacebuilding mandates and helping countries to meet multifaceted post-conflict demands in the field. The Council members' visit to Liberia and Sierra Leone in May should be useful in identifying the gaps and difficulties that the PBC is facing on the ground. Such visits also reinforce the Security Council-Peacebuilding Commission relationship in an effective, dynamic, synergistic and forward-thinking manner. When the interrelationship between the two bodies is further strengthened, we will be in a better position for meeting new challenges on the ground as they arise.

In addition, the PBC should develop a systematic way for the Security Council to take better advantage of the lessons learned and assets acquired through the Commission's activities in the six country-specific configurations. The accumulated lessons learned and experiences of each configuration can add valuable perspective to the discussions in the Security Council on countries on the PBC's agenda. However, I would like to note that the configurations, which are the main vehicles for the PBC's activities, are generally under-utilized. I see potential areas where synergy could be created if the configurations' assets are efficiently made part of the discussions in the Security Council. We also believe that more modalities need to be developed to enhance the interactivity between the configurations and the Security Council.

The Republic of Korea has contributed to peacebuilding activities, including serving as a Vice-Chair of the PBC in 2009 and as a member of the Organizational Committee, and donated $4 million to the Peacebuilding Fund since its establishment in 2006. My delegation stands ready to further scale up our contributions to the noble cause of peacebuilding and looks forward to more discussion in the Security Council and the General Assembly on ways to improve the PBC's role with a view towards a more secure and sustainable world.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): I now give the floor to the representative of Mexico.

Mrs. Morgan (Mexico) (*spoke in Spanish*): My delegation would like to thank the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Colombia, Ms. María Ángela Holguín Cuéllar, for convening this debate on peacebuilding processes in post-conflict situations. This discussion will contribute to strengthening the work of the Peacebuilding Commission and help make its processes more effective, thereby allowing us to take advantage of lessons learned in the seven years of its existence and improve the coherence, consistency and coordination with other bodies of the United Nations.

Experience in the past few years has shown that promoting social stability is a key part of the process of peacebuilding. Based on the priorities set forth by a country itself, post-conflict strategies should include actions to tackle poverty, unemployment and economic and social inequality, guarantee an appropriate balance between the requirements of reform in the security sector, strengthen the rule of law and attend to the basic needs of the people.

In that regard, Mexico reaffirms the need to stress national ownership throughout the process of peacebuilding and supports the Commission's work plan, which is focused on promoting the development

of national capacity, the mobilization of resources, the grouping of key agents around common objectives for peacebuilding and the adoption of collaboration instruments that are flexible and adapted to the reality of each country.

As a co-facilitator of the 2010 review of the Peacebuilding Commission, Mexico welcomes the progress achieved in complying with the recommendations set forth in the report (S/2011/527) of the Secretary-General, specifically implementing the plan of action to strengthen the Organization's capacity and mechanisms so that it can have greater impact in the field and strengthening the Commission's relations with key operative entities of the United Nations system both at Headquarters and in the field. We also welcome the adoption of General Assembly resolution 66/255, whose objective is to provide continuity in the civilian capacity initiative, which is promoting the development of national capacities, furthers South-South and regional cooperation and increases the participation of women to that end.

That progress also includes efforts to address pending challenges, such as strengthening synergies and associations with other relevant actors at Headquarters and with regional development banks, civil society organizations and national authorities. Moreover, strategies for peacebuilding should be broadened, including going beyond those countries that are on the Commission's agenda.

In that work, it is important to leverage the advice and value added of the Peacebuilding Commission in discussions with the Security Council and to continue promoting the participation of the Chairs of the country-specific configurations in its deliberations. Their contributions should provide high-quality analysis that can contribute to improving the mandates of peacekeeping missions, particularly in transition processes.

For the Commission to be able to fully comply with its mandate, it is necessary that it receive financial resources in a predictable manner through the Peacebuilding Fund. Mexico has voluntarily contributed financially to the Fund and has proposed programmes for electoral training in some post-conflict countries.

In 2010, during the review of the Peacebuilding Commission's work, the central question was identifying the added value that the Commission could bring to the peacebuilding architecture, both within the United Nations and outside of it. Two years after that assessment, Mexico recognizes that the Commission has increased its political weight and its power to bring key agents together. The positive results of the work of some of the country configurations are proof of that.

Mexico will continue to support the Commission so that it can grow in strength as a key tool to mobilize efforts for peacebuilding and reconstruction in countries in post-conflict situations.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): I now give the floor to the representative of Ireland.

Ms. Anderson (Ireland): I thank you, Madam President, for scheduling today's debate. A longer version of my statement will be circulated.

It is almost two years to the day since the co-facilitators — of which I was privileged to be one — submitted our review of the operation of the United Nations peacebuilding architecture (S/2010/393, annex). The report of the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC) before us today (S/2012/70) collates much useful information on the steps taken throughout 2011. There is also a degree of analysis and honest appraisal.

As always, the commitment of the Chairs — and the dedication of the staff of the Peacebuilding Support Office — shines through. The progress of the past year is in no way to be undervalued, and the European Union statement, with which we are associated, recognizes a number of the advances made. But if I speak today with some sense of impatience, it is not just as a co-facilitator of the 2010 review, but as representative of a country that is a committed and a long-standing supporter of United Nations peacebuilding.

The 2010 review was framed as a wake-up call. The co-facilitators said that

> "either there is a conscious recommitment to peacebuilding at the very heart of the work of the United Nations, or the Peacebuilding Commission settles into the limited role that has developed so far." (*S/2010/393, annex, executive summary*)

Despite the advances to which the 2011 report testifies, it would be hard to feel that the qualitative change the review called for has taken place or is in the process of taking place. We need to put matters in context: there is no room for complacency about any aspect of the peace and security work of the United Nations. The PBC is not a single malfunctioning piece in

otherwise satisfactory and smooth-running machinery. I think we all know the questions that are accumulating about aspects of United Nations peacekeeping. We also need to be conscious of the inherently complex and multifaceted work of peacebuilding. Nevertheless, a few things would benefit from being plainly stated at this stage.

First, as we look at the often crowded field of peacebuilding, we reiterate constantly that what is distinctive about the PBC is its intergovernmental and representative character. It is that intergovernmental character that confers political weight and allows the PBC to bring its specific strengths to bear.

So what is wrong with this picture? The fact is that we as Member States often do not play our part in giving true value to the intergovernmental character of the PBC. The Chairs of the configurations are often left feeling too much alone in shouldering the responsibilities. The concept is that, in their meetings and their work generally, Chairs will be supported by appropriately ranked representatives from across the configuration membership who will bring authority and expertise to the table. If we are frank, we will recognize the gap between concept and current reality, and the PBC Chair said as much in his remarks here this morning. We need activist Chairs and activist membership. All of us, including those who have permanent seats on the PBC, might reflect on how we could better play our part.

Secondly, there is the question of the weight accorded to peacebuilding and, by extension, to the Peacebuilding Support Office (PBSO) within the Secretariat. As in bureaucracies generally, a seat at the table has to be earned, but there also has to be a readiness on the part of others to make space. Despite improvements, there is a definite need for further steps to be taken to achieve a stronger and more coherent focus on peacebuilding within the Secretariat.

It is worth noting that in the original concept of the 2004 High-level Panel on Threats, Challenges and Change, the PBSO was envisaged as operating in association with a powerful new Deputy Secretary-General position. The co-facilitators of the review recalled that proposal but did not seek to revive it. However, as it now happens, our new Deputy Secretary-General is a person who was there at the creation. As President of the General Assembly at its sixtieth session, in 2005, Jan Eliasson played a key role in forging agreement on the PBC, and his speeches give eloquent testimony to the hopes that attended the birth of the new body. His involvement now from within the Secretariat can hopefully provide the impetus for some serious further thinking about how those hopes of 2005 can be better realized.

Thirdly, there is the question of interaction with the Security Council. The PBC 2011 report states that the relationship continued to develop during the reporting period but "there is growing recognition that additional efforts are needed on both sides to strengthen the relationship" (*S/2012/70, para. 24*). Despite the advances that the report acknowledges, it seems that a persistent, low-level mutual frustration continues to characterize the relationship between the two bodies, to the impoverishment of the deliberations of each. The growing recognition of which the PBC report speaks must be seized on, and the ideas put forward in the report, together with the United Kingdom paper and other inputs – including proposals made in a number of interventions here today – should provide a basis for concrete discussion.

This debate is hopefully the beginning of a new level of engagement on the part of the Security Council. There is need to move forward in a way that is both supportive and clear-eyed, recognizing the progress made but being frank about the distance to be travelled.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): I now give the floor to the representative of New Zealand.

Ms. Hay (New Zealand): As an active participant in post-conflict peacebuilding efforts in our own Asia-Pacific region, New Zealand follows international discussions on peacebuilding with considerable interest. The establishment of the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC) has provided a valuable tool for strengthening peacebuilding policy and practice across the United Nations system. Inevitably there have been teething problems, but the PBC can claim significant accomplishments during its first years. Today we need to focus on the PBC's positive potential.

Too often, international support for post-conflict States has been disparate and dysfunctional. The PBC has demonstrated a new model for engagement with such States, one that better integrates international support for addressing their development and security challenges. The PBC has also been a pillar of support for small, vulnerable States. Small States are overrepresented among the countries struggling to achieve development goals, and those afflicted by fragility and instability.

It is therefore not surprising that five of the six nations that have sought PBC assistance have been small States. The PBC has helped provide them with more consistent, integrated support.

The PBC's flexible, innovative working methods and its inclusive approach are particularly noteworthy. Through them it has engaged all parties needed at the table, involving interested States and relevant international organizations in its work in practical ways. Nor has it been jealously wedded to uniformity. Its configurations are tailored to the priority needs of the countries on its agenda; their work on the ground has been detailed and practical, with configuration Chairs making many in-country visits. By focusing on national ownership and national capacity-building in ways that the Security Council often fails to do, the PBC has been able to engage host countries on the basis of local realities, rather than the remote political perspectives that obtain here in New York. As a result, it generally avoids politicization.

In short, the PBC's working methods are well adapted to the practical needs of the complex situations it deals with, situations that were never foreseen in the Charter. As the Security Council reflects on its own working methods, it could benefit from drawing on lessons learned from the PBC regarding the practical benefits of more flexible and inclusive working methods. Enhanced dialogue between Council members and PBC configuration Chairs has been a useful first step, but much more can be done in that regard.

New Zealand is, however, concerned that a wide and dangerous gap is now apparent in the peacebuilding architecture of the United Nations. While the PBC is doing well with regard to its agenda, there are peacebuilding needs that would benefit from its attention but where a PBC country configuration is not possible. One way to address this would be to explore more varied, multi-tiered forms of PBC engagement, as recommended in the 2010 review of the United Nations peacebuilding architecture. New Zealand would support the consideration of lighter options that could broaden the utility and appeal of the Peacebuilding Commission for post-conflict States.

The Council also has an important role to play. Current Council practice does not readily accommodate the inclusive, practical, sustained approaches required to tackle peacebuilding challenges effectively. For more than a decade, the Council has acknowledged, in numerous debates and statements, the need for better integration of peacebuilding and peacekeeping efforts in its work. We acknowledge the leadership of current and former Council members, such as South Africa and Brazil, in highlighting both the need for better integration of United Nations efforts and the dangers and expense of focusing solely or principally on peacekeeping tools.

But it is not enough for the Council to keep rediscovering this question in the abstract every few years. We must move forward to the consideration of innovative, practical responses tailored to specific cases. That may require new working methods that would enable Council members to interact with other United Nations bodies in order to better manage cases where both peacekeeping and peacebuilding are essential, but where the PBC is not able to assume primary responsibility.

Ensuring national ownership and building sustainable national capacities are core goals in post-conflict peacebuilding, and timely identification and deployment of appropriate civilian expertise are vital. Yet, the range of expertise required and the current inadequacies in the ability of the United Nations to identify, deploy and effectively utilize such expertise have severely limited its effectiveness.

New Zealand welcomed the Secretary-General's 2011 report on civilian capacity in the aftermath of conflict (S/2011/527). We encourage its implementation by relevant United Nations bodies, including the PBC and the Security Council. Our success in such endeavours will have a material impact on the ability of the United Nations to meet the lofty goals it has set itself for supporting the development of effective national institutions.

The PBC can be proud of its achievements over the past six years. There is much that other United Nations bodies, including the Council, could learn from its flexible, pragmatic approach; but there is also clearly more that the PBC can do to fulfil its considerable potential. New Zealand will continue to play its part in our collective efforts towards that end.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): I now give the floor to the representative of Malaysia.

Mr. Abdullah (Malaysia): At the outset, allow me to congratulate you, Madam President, on Colombia's

assumption of the presidency of the Council for the month of July.

I also wish to associate my statement with that made by the representative of Tunisia on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement.

Peacekeeping and peacebuilding are two sides of the same coin. The efforts of United Nations States Members to preempt violence and ensure stability and security for civilians have been well documented over the Organization's history. With more than 100,000 soldiers and civilians deployed in a host of peacekeeping missions, it is evident that peacekeeping and peacebuilding work will continue to be staples of United Nations efforts to ensure international peace and security.

The creation of the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC) has been worthy of praise. While Malaysia values the role and functions of the Commission, we must also understand the need to be pragmatic in our approach to peacebuilding. The report of the Peacebuilding Commission on its fifth session (S/2012/70) gives a clear accounting of the Commission's activities and initiatives in 2011. In that connection, we note the report's suggestion that the need for greater interaction between the Commission and the Security Council is crucial and that efforts towards it should be intensified. More meaningful interaction, synergy of effort and coordination between the two United Nations bodies would only benefit stakeholders in promoting stability and peace.

At a higher level, the Commission's relations with other United Nations entities and with regional organizations could also be improved in order to encourage the sharing of related experience and capacity in post-conflict efforts. Additionally, intra-system relationships should be encouraged in order to enhance the coordination and interconnectedness between the PBC, the Peacebuilding Support Office, the Peacebuilding Fund and other related partners.

Malaysia realizes that peacebuilding requires financial support in order to build national institutions and strengthen governance in State development. In supporting efforts aimed at resource mobilization, it would be very helpful for the Commission to make increased efforts to interact with other possible partners. Such interactions would encourage the exploration of mutually beneficial possibilities and opportunities.

The Commission's current areas of activity should have the capacity to include other areas as it develops effective mapping models, in order to develop clear, credible programmes that include coordination on humanitarian assistance, reconstruction, governance and the rebuilding of public institutions. In that context, the Commission has taken the right step with its road map of action for 2012. However, it is essential that the road map be continually and consistently updated.

As I said earlier, Malaysia believes that the roles played by the United Nations in peacekeeping and peacebuilding are interrelated. In fact, considering the complex dimensions of many conflicts today, we believe that peacebuilding represents a complete system of conflict resolution. While peacekeeping is designed to restore security and stability, peacebuilding encompasses wider involvement in an array of equally important issues that include, for example, humanitarian relief and post-conflict reconstruction.

In post-conflict initiatives, the role of the international community in developing the economies of conflict-affected areas is pivotal for lessening the possibility of re-emerging wars, particularly since many of the parts of the world most affected by conflict are located in some of the world's most impoverished areas. It is therefore only logical to address the socio-economic well-being of the population in affected areas.

The formula Malaysia has consistently applied in post-conflict initiatives has always centred on socio-economic development and on building the capacity of local stakeholders. Through the Malaysian Technical Cooperation Programme, Malaysia has contributed to developing the capacity of Member States in need. We believe that such capacity-building programmes can contribute to resolving conflicts.

Malaysia's contribution to peacebuilding work does not end there. To support peacebuilding and humanitarian efforts, Malaysia also hosts the fifth and largest United Nations humanitarian response depot. The depot in Malaysia currently hosts 40 different international organizations operating throughout the region. Malaysia vigorously encourages Member States and other stakeholders to make full use of the depot in Malaysia as a regional hub for providing storage, logistics support and services to United Nations humanitarian agencies, international humanitarian organizations, and governmental and non-governmental

organizations, thus helping to strengthen their capacities for humanitarian, emergency and peacebuilding efforts.

Malaysia has been an active participant in international security and peacebuilding initiatives. In that regard, Malaysia hopes to achieve better interactions with the Commission, with members of the different configurations and their Chairs, and with other interested partners in generating capacity synergies. We wish to assure Member States that Malaysia will continue to be an active player and a reliable partner in international efforts to support peace and national rebuilding initiatives in post-conflict situations.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): I now give the floor to the representative of Armenia.

Mr. Nazarian (Armenia): I would like to thank you, Madam President, for the opportunity to present our views on the subject of post-conflict peacebuilding. We also acknowledge the presence and statements of Her Excellency Minister of Foreign Affairs Holguín Cuéllar and Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon, and we thank both the outgoing Chair of the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC), Ambassador Gasana, and the current Chair, Ambassador Momen, for their active involvement in addressing this important subject.

We share the views expressed by previous speakers calling for consistency in pursuing post-conflict peacebuilding and acknowledging our common responsibility for fulfilling commitments undertaken to support countries that have emerged from conflicts. Armenia is committed to post-conflict peace initiatives and strongly believes that the Security Council should further strengthen the rule of law and, in parallel, advance development initiatives.

That can be achieved by supporting peacebuilding mechanisms such as the Peacebuilding Commission, which helps countries emerging from conflict in their recovery and reconstruction efforts aimed at creating the foundations for durable peace and sustainable development. It is important that the PBC has shouldered the vital task for United Nations peacekeeping of defining post-conflict strategies. We find it encouraging that the recent report (S/2012/70) shows some promising results in some countries.

Regarding the relationship between the PBC and the Security Council, we believe that the two should work closely together, using each other's expertise and knowledge of the specifics of the situation on the ground to clearly identify priorities in order to make the most effective use of the limited resources allocated to peacebuilding efforts. For that relationship to be workable, the two bodies should try to be as flexible as possible, addressing the consequences of any conflict in a timely and efficient manner, since each conflict poses unique problems and requires specific solutions.

Although lessons have been learned and various approaches refined as the international community grapples with different approaches for dispute resolution, the tendency for a top-down approach persists, at times ignoring the specific context, roots and causes of a given conflict.

At the same time, we are of the view that we have not yet employed an essential resource that could bring us closer to sustainable economic development by creating opportunities for trade, investment and jobs, leading to engagement and solutions on the political front. One might question the value of embarking on the peacebuilding effort in a post-conflict situation while negotiations among the parties are ongoing. However, international experience shows that economic cooperation and interaction could be valuable confidence-building measures, often leading to political stability.

In order to achieve greater coherence in the region and to expand the geographic area of cooperation, the South Caucasus expects a coordinated and supportive approach and implementation of the various regional initiatives and programmes sponsored by donor countries and organizations. In addition, international financial institutions, as well as private sector contributions, should play a decisive role in moving towards that end.

We must recommit to such an approach and actively stay engaged also on the domestic level by promoting inclusive and accountable political processes. The post-conflict period offers a window of opportunity to provide basic security, deliver peace dividends, build confidence in the political process and strengthen core national ownership to spearhead peacebuilding efforts. Armenia therefore welcomes the Columbian initiative to hold this open debate, which is an opportunity to reflect on our past experiences and to highlight priority aspects in supporting countries' practical actions to lay down the foundations for sustainable peace and development.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): I now give the floor to the representative of Indonesia.

Mr. Khan (Indonesia): I commend you, Madam President, for convening this important open debate on the report of the Peacebuilding Commission (S/2012/70). I would also like to thank the Secretary-General for his remarks. My delegation also thanks Ambassador Richard Gasana and Ambassador Momen, the respective former and current Chairs of the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC), for their useful statements. We also thank the other briefers for their presentations.

Indonesia aligns itself with the statement made by the representative by Tunisia on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement caucus of the PBC.

Confronted with multiple challenges, countries emerging from conflict navigate a critical path that can lead to successful rebuilding and peace or a relapse into instability and violence. Which path it is depends primarily on the quality of nationally identified and nationally owned and driven peacebuilding. However, that quality, in large measure, also depends on the support of a robust and global peacebuilding architecture.

Indonesia is therefore pleased that, in a relatively short span of time, the PBC, its country specific configurations and the Peacebuilding Fund have progressed well and marked their status internationally.

As reflected in the report on its fifth session, the Commission's increased focus on the ground in the six countries on its agenda, its comprehensive approach and greater outreach and advocacy to the wider stakeholders have increased its impact at the country level. Thus, the role of the Security Council, as one of the parent bodies of the PBC, is crucial. The Council's support to the PBC and its utilization of the PBC's advisory role are highly beneficial. We are pleased that the Council is increasingly including the Chairs of the PBC configurations when the particular country situations are before it. The Council's stronger engagement with the countries on the PBC agenda, as well as with the other post-conflict countries considered by it, will also be useful.

Regular and meaningful cross-fertilization on fostering sustainable global peace and well-being among the PBC, the Security Council, the General Assembly and the Economic and Social Council, working within their respective mandates, is also very important. Indonesia fully supports it. I wish to make a few further observations as follows.

First, national ownership is critical. To foster that, it is vital that engagement frameworks and the support of the Commission and the Peacebuilding Fund, as well as international financial institutions, be in consonance with the nationally identified needs and priorities of post-conflict countries.

Secondly, the experience of the PBC has provided it with highly valuable knowledge and insights, which, apart from the Security Council, should be further drawn on the United Nations peacekeeping architecture, especially in relation to early peacebuilding tasks by peacekeepers. We should not be hesitant in drawing on each other's comparative advantages, and there should be greater interface among the PBC, international financial institutions and other relevant non-United Nations actors, as well.

Thirdly, in the ongoing review of global civilian capacities for countries emerging from conflict and those in transition, the PBC's advisory role, with its practical inputs on improving the United Nations system of harnessing and supporting civilian capacities, is highly important. We hope that the Commission will contribute actively to that exercise.

Fourthly, Indonesia strongly supports the focus on resource mobilization and partnerships, as contained in the PBC road map of actions in 2012. In that context, the outcome of the Task Force on the role of the private sector in post-conflict peacebuilding, which Indonesia had the privilege of facilitating in 2008, provided some very useful recommendations. We have repeatedly called for the PBC to further carry forward the various important recommendations therein. We are pleased that the Peacebuilding Support Office (PBSO) has recently come up with a document that builds on a number of the Task Force's recommendations. We hope that those recommendations will be actualized.

Fifthly, in order to increase international attention and political support, disseminate best practices and build closer connections between the actors in New York and those at the country level, we have proposed that the PBC hold a dedicated annual session. The session should include relevant key governmental and non-governmental participants from all PBC Organizational Committee members and the PBC agenda countries, as well as from the United Nations system, such as the PBSO, the United

Nations Development Programme, the Department of Peacekeeping Operations, the Department of Field Support and the Department of Political Affairs.

As the world's third largest democracy, and having gone through its own transition to a well-functioning democratic State, Indonesia bears witness to the different challenges and opportunities for building peace. As we have directly seen the fruit of national capacity development, we firmly believe in it. Indonesia has achieved major reforms in many areas, including the rule of law, inclusive political processes, elections, media development, civil society participation, good governance and human rights.

We are keen to share, and have shared, our experience and expertise with others in the global South and to learn from the experiences of others. Thus, enhanced regional, South-South and triangular cooperation is a key part of Indonesia's efforts to support the capacity development of countries affected by conflict and those in transition.

In closing, Indonesia expresses its strong determination to continue to steadfastly supporting the PBC and to play its role in realizing even more strongly supported and robust responses from the PBC.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): I now give the floor to the representative of Norway.

Mr. Wetland (Norway): The Peacebuilding Commission (PBC) was intended to play a crucial role as an intergovernmental body that can engage the world community in supporting States in their peacebuilding processes. In that regard, the PBC has certainly brought more sustained attention to the countries on its agenda, which could otherwise easily have fallen below the radar screen. However, after four years of service at the United Nations, it surprises me that each time I ask colleagues what, in their view, is the core of peacebuilding, I receive different answers. It is clear that the PBC is still struggling to define its role. We need to continuously ask ourselves how we can make sure that that intergovernmental body can bring added value, not only added numbers of documents and processes. We have a common responsibility in addressing that challenge.

One of the overarching recommendations from the 2010 review of the United Nations peacebuilding architecture was to enhance the interaction between the Commission and the countries concerned, in order to ensure genuine impact in the field. The way we see it, the country-specific configurations could work primarily as a support group for the Special Representatives of the Secretary-General and the United Nations country teams, and refrain from becoming an additional administrative layer.

The review also stressed the need for better cooperation between the PBC and other actors, including the Security Council. There has been some progress, but we need to further accelerate that work. We would also like to highlight the common meeting of the Organizational Committee of the PBC and the Executive Board of UN-Women in which one of the conclusions was to initiate country-specific discussions on the progress and challenges of integrating women into peacebuilding.

We value all the work on resource mobilization that has been done, in particular in the country-specific configurations. Norway will continue to provide more than 1 per cent of our gross national income in development aid. We do so also as a challenge and encouragement to new partners and emerging Powers to increase their support. Indeed, the challenge is also extended to currently underperforming but potentially large donors. Let me stress that we are pleased with the broadening of the donor base in the Peacebuilding Fund (PBF).

The Fund's focus on countries low on the donor radar, its swiftness, its willingness to take risk and its large donor base constitute the Fund's main strengths and added value. Furthermore, considerable progress has been made in establishing the PBF as an effective and accountable funding mechanism. We note that the Fund will need to work harder in order to attain the goal of a 15 per cent allocation focused on women's specific needs. We look forward to rapid progress in that regard.

Last year, Norway made a new $5 million contribution to the PBF for the year 2011. I am pleased to formally announce that we will provide the same amount for 2012. The improvement in the management of the PBF has been important for us. But we are also very much aware that, if we want to focus on results and strict measures against corruption, there is a need for the PBF to take risks. The risk of failing to engage in areas in conflict far outweighs most of the risks — if we are honest about our efforts — of our collective but modest engagement.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): I now give the floor to the representative of Egypt.

Mr. Khalil (Egypt): Egypt would like to align itself with the statement delivered by the representative of Tunisia on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement.

I also wish to thank His Excellency Mr. Abulkalam Abdul Momen, Permanent Representative of Bangladesh, the Chair of the Peacebuilding Commission, and Ambassador Eugène-Richard Gasana, the outgoing Chair, for their statements.

The post-conflict peacebuilding architecture of the United Nations brings together security and development actors to promote common, integrated and mutually reinforcing approaches to building and sustaining peace. That multifaceted nature of post-conflict peacebuilding implies certain challenges. Among the most important of those challenges is, first, building the national capacities of post-conflict countries, which should be at the centre of all of our efforts to achieve sustainable peace and prevent conflicts from relapsing. In that context, Egypt would like to recall its initiative to establish an African Union centre for post-conflict reconstruction and development.

Secondly, establishing a nexus between peace and development by consolidating the culture of peace will lead to stability as a cornerstone for sustainable economic development.

Thirdly, there is the challenge of intensifying national ownership to guarantee that peacebuilding programmes are responsive to the actual needs of each country and consequently harmonize the interaction between United Nations Headquarters and the peacebulding missions on the ground.

One of the most important aspects for the Peacebulidng Commission is the growing interest in its work on the part of the General Assembly, the Security Council and the Economic and Social Council. That presents a good opportunity for the Commission to act as a liaison between the main United Nations organs, other agencies within the United Nations system and the international financial institutions to establish a more effective mechanism for resource mobilization to strengthen the Peacebuilding Commission and enhance its role in achieving sustainable peace and development in the countries on its agenda.

To conclude, I would like to reiterate the importance of the lessons learned from past experiences in the countries that are on the Commission's agenda. They represent an invaluable asset for the Commission that should be utilized in the future. I would like also to assure the Council that Egypt remains ready to provide its civilian expertise for peacebuilding in the immediate aftermath of conflict according to General Assembly resolution 66/255.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): I now give the floor to the representative of Nigeria.

Mr. Okafor (Nigeria): On behalf of the Nigerian delegation, I would like to thank you, Madam President, for convening this important meeting on post-conflict peacebuilding. I would also like to thank Ambassador Abulkalam Abdul Momen, Permanent Representative of Bangladesh and current Chair of the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC), and Ambassador Eugène-Richard Gasana, Permanent Representative Rwanda and former Chair of the Commission, for their statements, which provided fresh perspectives on the activities of the Peacebuilding Commission.

My delegation would also like take this opportunity to thank the Chairs of the various country-specific configurations for their untiring efforts in channelling assistance to the countries on the Commission's agenda, as well as the Peacebuilding Support Office for being a critical success factor in the global peacebuilding efforts.

Nigeria fully aligns itself with the statement made on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement, but nonetheless would like to underscore a few issues of interest to my delegation.

Today's debate is indeed an opportunity to assess the progress and challenges of our collective effort to support peace and socio-economic development for countries emerging from conflict. Well before the inception of the PBC, Nigeria undertook efforts to support post-conflict peacebuilding in various countries in Africa, especially in West Africa. The lessons from that experience motivated Nigeria to convene the open debate on preventive diplomacy in the Security Council in July 2010 (see S/PV.6360). It reflected our concern that the scale and scope of the new forms of conflict and the ever-present risk of relapse were outpacing our collective ability to respond effectively to conflict.

After six years of the existence of the PBC, post-conflict peacebuilding remains a fragile but promising undertaking. Recent developments in some

countries on the PBC's agenda have underscored the fact that peacebuilding requires a more integrated approach that encompasses political inclusiveness, security, human rights, economic development and the rule of law.

My delegation would also want to highlight four major challenges that have an impact on peacebuilding efforts.

First, our individual and collective commitment to the activities of the Peacebuilding Commission, especially in the country-specific configurations, must be supportive and result-oriented. Our experience to date proves that both the participation in the mandate of the configurations and the willingness to contribute are more rhetorical than actual.

Secondly, the commitment of members must extend beyond mere interest. It should be reflected in their desire to share experiences and provide technical and financial contributions. Three days ago, the Organizational Committee of the PBC discussed a paper on resource mobilization for peacebuilding priorities prepared by the Peacebuilding Support Office. The paper identifies specific actions that the Chairs and members of the country-specific configurations can take to advance their work on resource mobilization. It offered a menu of 42 options in resource mobilization for the PBC to carry forward in the implementation of this critical mandate. The PBC must now rise to the challenge by focusing on some pertinent options in order to advance its work on resource mobilization for countries on its agenda.

Thirdly, there has been much talk about the expectations that the Security Council has for the PBC. This debate is therefore an opportunity for Council members to clearly spell out what those expectations are and how the PBC should meet them, including by meeting periodically to examine progress in fulfilling them. In saying this, we recognize that the founding resolutions assigned the PBC three critical tasks: political accompaniment, advocacy and support; resource mobilization; and fostering coherence among various stakeholders. The tasks are clear, but the expectations relating to their delivery remain a matter for continuing dialogue.

Fourthly, peacebuilding is essentially about enhancing the capacity of the affected country to meet all the challenges of peacebuilding on its own. The role of the PBC and of the Security Council is to ensure that their engagement with the countries on the agenda results in a strengthening of the capacity of these countries to undertake the task of peacebuilding on their own. This is in line with the principle of national ownership, which is becoming increasingly central to debates on post-conflict peacebuilding.

As a member of the PBC Organizational Committee, Nigeria remains committed to supporting the integrated peacebuilding strategies of the Commission. It is our fervent hope that this debate will provide new insights into and impetus for enhancing post-conflict peacebuilding activities. We are also determined to work in concert with other stakeholders to ensure that this impact is felt positively.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): I now give the floor to the representative of South Sudan.

Mr. Nazario (South Sudan): I thank Colombia for convening this open debate on post-conflict peacebuilding. I would also like to thank the outgoing and current Chairs of the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC) for their statements and the representative of the World Bank for his valuable contribution this morning.

The Republic of South Sudan appreciates the opportunity to share its views with the Security Council on the issue of post-conflict peacebuilding, which is the essence of what we are trying to achieve as a young nation. We have much to learn from such debates, as the experience of others may help us to forge ahead with our own development goals.

As the Council is aware, the Republic of South Sudan marked its first anniversary a few days go, on 9 July. The Republic of South Sudan faces the challenge of ongoing negotiations with the Republic of the Sudan on border demarcation and the final status of several disputed areas. South Sudan has also experienced episodes of intra-tribal conflict with deep historical roots, some of which is also politically motivated. Both of these are drivers of fragility in our young nation.

My Government's primary objective is the establishment of a sustainable peace so that all the people of South Sudan can have a life of dignity. To achieve this, we must conclude our negotiations with our neighbour, the Republic of the Sudan, in a way that produces a lasting agreement. We must also strengthen the capacity of our institutions to deliver services, respect the rights and privileges of our people, provide protection to all civilians and promote national healing.

We welcome the recent decision of the Council to renew the mandate of the United Nations Mission in the Republic of South Sudan (UNMISS), and we welcome in particular the support provided by UNMISS to strengthen our institutions.

In situations as complex as that in which South Sudan finds itself, the challenge is always to identify priorities, coordinate the required work and apportion resources accordingly. We look forward to continuing to partner with the United Nations and other development and humanitarian partners in these important prioritization and coordination efforts.

In this regard, we welcome the Council's call in resolution 2057 (2012) for a coordinated approach between the United Nations Mission, the United Nations country team, United Nations agencies, and multilateral and bilateral donors in support of national State-building and peacebuilding strategies. We look forward to working in partnership with the United Nations, international financial institutions and bilateral donors to build our institutions, strengthen the rule of law and ensure that the human rights of all South Sudanese are fully respected, in accordance with South Sudan's own development priorities, as articulated in the South Sudan Development Plan. We would also welcome a dialogue with the PBC on these complex coordination challenges in order to establish whether there is a need to coordinate further our comprehensive and interlinked peacebuilding efforts.

It is important for the Government of the Republic of South Sudan to reiterate that the decision to shut down its oil production was taken with a deep sense of responsibility towards the people of South Sudan. In the light of the clear evidence that shipments of South Sudanese oil were being seized illegally and the fact that payments dating back to July 2011 had been withheld, the temporary halting of production was necessary, despite the sacrifices it has entailed, in order to ensure a just outcome for the people of South Sudan in the longer term. We are currently operating on an austerity budget due to the loss of our oil revenue, and we are looking at other mechanisms to diversify our economy. This may take some time to develop, but we remain steadfast in our wish to achieve sustainable economic growth for our people as a way to consolidate peace.

In our endeavour to continue security sector reform, we place special emphasis on the professionalization of the police, correctional services and the judiciary, as well as the provision of greater access to the justice system. The Republic of South Sudan is determined to establish sound institutions, the rule of law and a multiparty democratic system of governance.

The Government of the Republic of South Sudan also believes that no conflict can be resolved without an inclusive process, and we do not deny that a lot still needs to be done. It is only through the inclusion of all parts of society and their joint contribution towards our common goal that peace will be achievable. We look forward to continuing to work together with our many partners and friends to achieve this vision.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): I now give the floor to the representative of Nepal.

Mr. Acharya (Nepal): I wish to begin by thanking you, Madam, for organizing this open debate and chairing this meeting on the important issue of post-conflict peacebuilding. It shows your strong support for the cause.

I thank Ambassador Gasana of Rwanda, former Chair of the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC), and Ambassador Momen of Bangladesh, the current Chair, for the presentation of the report (S/2012/70) and their valuable statements.

Peacebuilding has come to the centre stage today as a result of the changing landscape of global peace and security.

The United Nations has a responsibility and an opportunity to act swiftly and effectively in the assistance of the countries emerging from conflict in order to make sure that peace, development and the protection of human rights become sustainable there. That is possible only when we ensure them due priority, promote focused and coordinated attention, and enhance support in a sustained manner. We are all aware that the Peacebuilding Commission was established in 2005 to address their special situation and needs in a more coordinated manner.

No matter how fragile the situation may be, it is very important that we build and promote national leadership and ownership in such countries. Peace can be made sustainable only by building and strengthening it. In the aftermath of conflicts, devastation is widespread and frustrations are rampant. The available resources are meager and institutions are non-functional or weak. This is the context in which peacebuilding-related work has to extend support for political processes, the rule

of law and justice, and basic delivery of services and economic revitalization, all at the same time and in a very coherent manner. The traditional approach does not work there effectively.

It is in that specific context that, as the representative of a country that expresses its support for the PBC, that I should like to dwell briefly on the questions that have been so pertinently raised in the concept paper before the Council (S/2012/511, annex).

The Peacebuilding Commission is a unique body because of its composition and mandate. It derives its strength from being an intergovernmental body to ensure a coordinated, coherent and integrated approach to post-conflict peacebuilding activities in the countries on its agenda. While there is a constant evolution of peacebuilding strategies based on the specific situations in the field, we have yet to use its full potentialities for effective peacebuilding. Ensuring political attention and support on a longer-term basis, and coordination and coherence among all stakeholders around the nationally developed, owned and implemented peacebuilding strategy highlights the added value of the PBC. Similarly, it should have wider and deeper consultations with the regional and subregional organizations.

The Security Council should support more systematic, substantive and institutionalized consultations with the PBC on the countries on its agenda. Better and robust coordination, coherence and collaboration at the field level, among the United Nations operation agencies and other regional and international organizations is what we are all looking for. Similarly, there should be a synergy of activities with a similar level of coherence at the headquarters level.

As to the political and structural tools of the PBC, Organizational Committee and the country-specific configurations are working hard to enhance the level of attention and provide more coherence among all relevant stakeholders at headquarters and field level respectively. But there is a long way to go. The role of the Organizational Committee could be made more active and dynamic with frequent and structured meetings with other United Nations bodies and the Bretton Woods institutions, including other interested stakeholders, at Headquarters level to mobilize both political and financial support. The Chairs of the configurations must be fully supported by the Organizational Committee, the Security Council and the General Assembly by initiating institutional consultations to draw upon their first-hand experiences in dealing with peacebuilding challenges in the field. Synergy between the PBC and the Peacebuilding Fund are sine quo non for the effective utilization of the Fund. The Working Group on Lessons Learned should also be fully utilized to look at the best practices from the field and disseminate and adopt such proven practices, wherever possible, for the effective implementation of peacebuilding activities. We need to bridge gap between expectations and delivery on the ground.

On the role of the Member States in empowering the PBC, it is indeed up to us, the Member States, to make the Commission an effective intergovernmental institutional mechanism to extend sustained support for peacebuilding. A higher level of engagement is critical. Several studies have underscored the fact that timely, sustained and adequate resources for the well-targeted activities are critical to making peacebuilding efforts a success. Moreover, we have heard from the field that if the PBC is to have more influence on the ground, it should be supported strongly to generate wider and sustained interest in the countries under its agenda. Results on the ground are what we are all looking for.

Member States should come forward with a renewed commitment to supporting the work of the Peacebuilding Commission by providing necessary financial resources for the nationally owned peacebuilding strategy. The PBC should also play a catalytic role in making available civilian experts in economic planning, judiciary reform, health, education and economic revitalization, including infrastructure development as per the specific needs of the country on the PBC agenda. These investments would pay off greatly in the form of domestic political stability and economic prosperity, which provide a very strong foundation for regional and international peace and security.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): I give the floor to the representative of Argentina.

Mr. Estremé (Argentina) (*spoke in Spanish*): At the outset, I should like to congratulate you, Madam, on the Colombian presidency of the Security Council this month, and to thank you for convening this open debate.

In the context of their responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security, the United Nations and the Security Council in particular

have a key role to play in organizing support to countries emerging from conflict, building lasting peace and laying the foundations for sustainable development. We believe that it is no exaggeration to assert that this is one of the main challenges now facing the international community and the Organization.

As highlighted in the 2010 review of the United Nations peacebuilding architecture (S/2010/393, annex), an effective response on the part of the Organization requires a broad, coordinated strategy that is based on the priorities identified by local authorities and establishes goals and specific timetables. This task requires the development of humanitarian, political and security activities and assistance, the restoration of the rule of law, the promotion of development and the protection and promotion of human rights. This is a major task.

In considering this issue, I wish to highlight the following three key aspects. First, my country reiterates its conviction that peacebuilding is essentially a national task and responsibility. It is clear that the support of the international community is essential in addressing reduced or destroyed local capacities following a conflict. International, regional, subregional and non-governmental organizations have a central role in developing institutional capacities, but they must always do so throughout the reconstruction process on the basis of the involvement, guidance and priorities established by local authorities. That will ensure an agreed approach that allows the root causes of a conflict to be addressed in a more effective and legitimate way. In that regard, we welcome the prioritization of national capacity development in the Commission's work, as stated in the report on its fifth session issued in January (S/2012/70).

Secondly, we stress that the role of coordinating all international peacebuilding assistance must be played by the United Nations. That role has not always been fully assumed, yet it is critical to ensuring the success of peacekeeping and peacebuilding alike. As my delegation has said in the Council on other occasions, in particular with reference to the situation in Haiti, the United Nations must concentrate the coordination of international efforts to ensure peacebuilding, with particular emphasis on the priorities established by the authorities of the beneficiary country, with the aim of reducing, in an organized and phased manner, the presence of the international community until it is no longer needed. The ability of local authorities to exercise their institutional capacity to assume their own responsibilities will be the gauge of the success of the Organization's work.

Thirdly, I stress the fundamental role played by regional and subregional organizations in accordance with Chapter VIII of the United Nations Charter, and the need to enhance the capacities of regional systems to support countries that are recovering or emerging from conflict. In that context, the United Nations has a no less important role to play, given its unique ability to mobilize financial, technical and political resources for peacebuilding activities and to establish synergies with regional and other international actors, ensuring that all such efforts contribute to the goal of strengthening institutions and accord with the priorities of the country concerned.

To conclude, Argentina is convinced that the United Nations has the crucial responsibility to support countries emerging from conflict, working with local authorities, regional organizations and other players, in order to achieve reconstruction, strengthen institutions and avert the possibility of a relapse into conflict. As is pointed out in the concept paper submitted by the Colombian delegation for today's debate (S/2012/511, annex), there can be no doubt that it is in political accompaniment, resource mobilization and fostering coherence that the added value of the Organization can be found.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): I now give the floor to the representative of the Sudan.

Mr. Osman (Sudan) (*spoke in Arabic*): At the outset, I congratulate the delegation of Colombia on its assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for this month.

Peacebuilding is the only guarantee for countries emerging from conflict against relapse into hostilities. In recent history, there have been numerous examples of countries falling back into conflict for various reasons, most important of which were poor judgment and the absence of good governance. In that regard, we recall the plans of action set forth by the Secretary-General in 2009 and 2010 on the issue before us today.

Although two years have elapsed since the most recent report of the Secretary-General (S/2010/386), we are still working to develop a United Nations integrated strategic approach through its peacekeeping missions in post-conflict countries, its country offices,

national Governments and relevant international financial agencies and organizations so as to meet the pressing needs that arise in the immediate aftermath of conflict, including capacity- and institution-building; disarmament, demobilization and reintegration; the return of refugees and internally displaced persons (IDPs) to their homes; and mine clearance.

In that regard, the delegation of the Sudan welcomes the participation of the representative of the World Bank in today's meeting, as well as the attendance of the representative of the Islamic Development Bank.

The most recent report of the Secretary-General highlights two new priorities in post-conflict peacebuilding: domestic and transnational organized crime, including drug trafficking, and disputes over natural resources, which regrettably have become one of the main causes of relapse into conflict, rather than the lynchpins of peace and development in countries emerging from conflict. In that regard, we recall the round table meeting organized by the Peacebuilding Fund on 22 November 2011, attended by representatives of some countries emerging conflict, the private sector – particularly the mining industry – non-governmental organizations and several international experts. The meeting emphasized the emergence of the aforementioned priorities as challenges in numerous countries emerging from conflict.

In addition to the two priority issues cited in the report of the Secretary-General as being threats to peace, my delegation would add the issue of financial corruption, which is plaguing some countries emerging from conflict and an important cause of relapse into conflict, instability and suffering for the people of those countries. In addition, countries emerging from conflict need rational political decision-making. It is unacceptable for a country to take decisions that aggravate the suffering of its people simply because it does not want to abide by international standards of economic and commercial relations.

We stress the importance of the role played by the Peacebuilding Commission and recall that its establishment – the culmination of difficult and prolonged negotiations during the 2005 World Summit held as a follow-up to the Millennium Summit, at which the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) were adopted – provided a shortcut towards the concrete achievement of peace on the ground through long- and short-term programmes designed to respond to immediate post-conflict needs. We would also recall the close interrelationship between peace and development as two basic complementary components.

National ownership and the sovereignty of States are among the important aspects that have to be taken into consideration in the implementation of post-conflict programmes and projects, as is the important role of international organizations, such as that of the African Union in the Sudan and other African countries.

In that context, my country, the Sudan, with all its broad experience and management ability, will seek peaceful and positive solutions to the issues now being negotiated in Addis Ababa between the Government of the Sudan and the Republic of South Sudan. Accordingly, I would remind the Council that the Government of the Sudan, committed as it is to peacebuilding in the newly established Republic of South Sudan, has allowed that State to transfer its oil through Sudanese territory, facilities, supply lines and ports for an entire year without charging a single dollar in exchange. When the Republic of South Sudan did not respond by paying the internationally agreed fees, we were compelled to act to protect the sovereignty of our land and prevent the waste of our resources.

With regard to the Sudan, just as it played a commendable role in implementing the Comprehensive Peace Agreement with the State of South Sudan, I should like to say that our experience in peacebuilding has come a long way in implementing the Doha Document for Peace in Darfur once the Darfur Regional Authority, which was established by that Document, assumed its functions. That has made it possible to enter the peacebuilding stage. Now that voluntary repatriation has been put in place throughout the territory, it is incumbent upon the international community, United Nations specialized agencies and the African Union-United Nations Hybrid Operation in Darfur to coordinate with the Regional Authority in order to leverage the greatest amount of resources and capacities to support peacebuilding projects in Darfur and ensure stability in the region. We also call upon the Security Council to take the necessary measures vis-à-vis those who reject peace and continue to impede peace and security in Darfur with the support of some neighbouring States, who themselves need stability more than others in order to address the needs of their peoples.

In conclusion, responding to the challenges of peacebuilding will not be possible unless there is support for sustainable development from donors and the international financial institutions, in particular the World Bank and other multilateral partners. That is all the more so given the fact that experience has shown — such as at the Oslo donors' conference following the 2005 signing of the Comprehensive Peace Agreement concerning South Sudan — that donor pledges at the conflict and peace-making stages tend to be very promising. However, regrettably, once the war come to an end and the implementation of the Peace Agreement and its programme began, the actual response in fulfilling the commitments made fell short of expectations, and was sometimes absent altogether.

I should also like to recall the importance of providing diversified sources of funding to the Peacebuilding Fund in order that it can respond immediately to urgent needs that cannot be put off.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): There are no more speakers inscribed on my list. The Security Council has thus concluded the present stage of its consideration of the item on its agenda.

The meeting rose at 6.15 p.m.